



BERKELEY, CALIFORNIA

RB 235201



WALSH
PHILOSOPHY
COLLECTION

PRESENTED *to the*
LIBRARIES *of the*
UNIVERSITY *of* TORONTO



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2007 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

1st Edition

Rare

THE LIFE OF JOHN LOCKE.

VOL. I.

“I think every one, according to what way providence has placed him in, is bound to labour for the public good as far as he is able ; or else he has no right to eat.” (A letter from Locke to William Molyneux.)

“He was always, in the greatest and in the smallest affairs of human life, as well as in speculative opinions, disposed to follow reason, whosoever it were that suggested it ; he being ever a faithful servant, I had almost said a slave, to truth ; never abandoning her for anything else, and following her for her own sake purely.” (A letter from Lady Masham to Jean Le Clerc.)

THE
LIFE OF JOHN LOCKE.

BY
H. R. FOX BOURNE.

IN TWO VOLUMES.

VOLUME I.

HENRY S. KING & Co., LONDON.

1876.

[The rights of translation and of reproduction are reserved.]

PREFACE.

IN 1705, a few months after Locke's death, his friend Jean Le Clerc published in the 'Bibliothèque Choisie' a brief 'Eloge de M. Locke,' which, as I have discovered, was little more than a translation of two letters that had been sent to him by competent authorities from whom he had sought information; the one written by the third Earl of Shaftesbury, author of 'Characteristics;' the other, much longer and more important, by Lady Masham, in whose house Locke chiefly resided during the last fourteen years of his life. Fairly accurate in its epitome of facts, and yet more accurate in its presentment of Locke's character, Le Clerc's graceful little memoir was all that could be expected as a magazine article, and deserved more careful rendering into English than it received in the version (small 4to, pp. iv., 32) published in London in 1706; but it was not adequate to the use made of it by all subsequent writers who have said anything about Locke's personal history. Issued with stray additions, more or less apocryphal, by way of prelude to the earlier collected editions of Locke's writings, it was re-written, with a

few further additions, by Bishop Law, for the edition of the 'Works' published in 1777, and in that shape has been frequently reprinted, epitomised, or adapted in biographical dictionaries and other publications. Even the late Lord King did little more than repeat the statements made by Le Clerc, ignoring Bishop Law's fuller sketch, in 'The Life of John Locke, with Extracts from his Correspondence, Journals, and Common-place Books,' which he published (4to, pp. 407) in 1829, and again, with some fresh matter (2 vols., 8vo., pp. 480, 375), in 1830.

As a lineal descendant of Locke's cousin and legatee, Lord King had in his possession an extremely valuable collection of documents, and in publishing portions of these he rendered an important service to the world. Considerably more than half of his work is occupied with selections from Locke's common-place books and journals, and transcripts and extracts from his correspondence fill more than a quarter. These materials, however, only serve to illustrate some passages in Locke's life, and some phases in his character; and Lord King, notwithstanding the title of his work, seems to have made no effort at all to string them together in any order, or to combine with them such information as he could procure from other sources. The writing of an orderly and comprehensive biography of the author of 'An Essay concerning Human Understanding' is for the first time attempted in the following volumes.

In preparing them I have made free use of Lord

King's book, as well as of all other publications bearing on the subject which I have been able to meet with, including, of course, the two collections of Locke's correspondence printed in most editions of his works.¹ By placing these already published materials in their proper connections, I hope that I have greatly enhanced their value as helps to an understanding of Locke's life and character. But more than half of the contents of this work are derived from hitherto unused manuscripts; and by them, in addition to their independent worth, altogether new light is thrown on most of the information that is not actually new.

I have been careful in foot-notes to indicate my authorities for all the important statements and quotations here made and given; but it may be well to point out very briefly the chief original and unprinted sources from which they are mainly drawn.

The least explored and almost the richest mine at which a student of Locke's biography can work is the splendid collection of family documents accumulated by the Earls of Shaftesbury. Locke having been a member of the first earl's household during many years, a very

¹ 'Some Familiar Letters between Mr. Locke and several of his Friends,' first published (8vo, pp. 540) in 1708; and 'Several Letters' included in 'A Collection of several Pieces of Mr. John Locke' (8vo, pp. 362), which appeared in 1720. These and other sources furnish two hundred and fifty-eight letters or extracts from letters written by or to Locke, in addition to the ninety-eight printed or referred to by Lord King. I have been able to make use of two hundred and eighteen letters—one hundred and seventy-six written by and forty-two written to Locke—which have never before been printed.

large quantity of his correspondence and memoranda, apparently lost sight of by him during the political turmoil that caused him to take shelter in Holland, was mixed up with the Shaftesbury Papers. Besides a great many letters written by and to him throughout the middle period of his life, and numerous other papers illustrating his career before and during that period, I have found in this collection the originals, in his handwriting, of several important essays and fragments of essays on political, religious, medical and other topics. As these documents, along with all the others inherited by the present Earl of Shaftesbury, have been generously placed by him at the disposal of all inquirers, and are now in the custody of the deputy keeper of the Public Records, I have been able to examine them much more easily and thoroughly than might have been possible had they remained, as formerly, at St. Giles's House.

I have made prolonged and careful search among the State Papers, both Domestic and Foreign, in the Public Record Office, and have extracted therefrom some material of value; but my examination of those collections has been far less successful than I had hoped that it would be. From some miscellaneous collections in the Record Office, however, especially from the old Board of Trade Papers, I have obtained a great deal of information about Locke and his work as the most energetic of William the Third's commissioners of trade.

Some of the manuscripts by and concerning Locke in the library of the British Museum have already been printed; but by far the larger portion have never yet been made public, or, as far as I know, referred to in any publication, and they have therefore been quite new material for my work. Among these may be enumerated several documents elucidating Locke's family history, and, more slightly, his own early life, a collection of medical notes made by him, a volume containing his journal for one year, and a great number of letters written during the last thirty-five years of his career.

From the Bodleian Library and the records of Christ Church, Oxford, from the Lambeth Library, and from other public collections, I have derived much valuable matter; and many documents of great interest have been kindly placed at my disposal by their possessors in various parts of the country.

In the Remonstrants' Library at Amsterdam I had access to a large and very important collection of Locke's correspondence with friends in that city. Thence I have obtained thirty-five new letters, and have recovered a great number of paragraphs omitted, because of their personal nature, from the published correspondence between Locke and Limborch which is contained in 'Some Familiar Letters.' It will be readily understood that, though immediately after Locke's death these paragraphs were excluded as trivial in comparison with the theological and philo-

sophical discussions that form the staple of this correspondence, they are now of special value to a biographer. At Amsterdam I also discovered a great many letters containing interesting references to Locke and illustrations of his life in Holland, the most important of all these latter documents being Lady Masham's long letter, telling all she knew or cared to tell about her friend, which furnished most of the material of Le Clerc's 'Eloge.' This letter, much more naïve and graphic in its original English than Le Clerc's French translation, and containing some passages that Le Clerc did not translate, supersedes the 'Eloge,' and is so interesting that nearly the whole of it has been copied at intervals into these volumes.

Finally, I must acknowledge my indebtedness to Mr. Alexander Burrell, who has placed in my hands copious notes and extracts from parish registers and various other local sources of information, collected by him during his pilgrimages to the haunts of Locke, both in England and on the continent.

15th March, 1876.

CONTENTS OF VOLUME I.

CHAPTER I.

YOUTH AND ITS SURROUNDINGS [1632—1652].

Locke's ancestors and kindred—his parents—his father's occupations as country attorney and captain in the parliamentary army—the civil war in the west	1—11
Locke's birth and early training—home influences	11—16
His admission to Westminster school—the education provided for him, and his judgment upon it—outside influences	16—25

CHAPTER II.

STUDENT LIFE AT OXFORD [1652—1660].

Locke's entrance at Christ Church—the condition of the university during the civil war—the religious and political reformation—academical discipline under the puritans	26—41
Locke's position as an undergraduate—his tutor—his daily occupations—the studies prescribed for him and his opinions thereupon—his Latin and English verses in praise of Cromwell	41—52

His studies for his M.A. degree—some of his university friends: Edward Poocke; Nathaniel Hodges; David Thomas; James Tyrrell	. 52—61
Descartes's teaching as an influence upon Locke—his first studies in philosophy	. 61—72
The political and religious movements of the time as influences upon Locke—Owen's advocacy of toleration—Oxford before the Restoration	. 72—79
Locke's relations with his father—his father's death—his property in Somersetshire	. 79—83

CHAPTER III.

FURTHER RESIDENCE AT OXFORD [1660—1667].

Oxford after the Restoration—Locke's occupations as Greek lecturer, reader in rhetoric, censor of moral philosophy, and college tutor—a testimonial as to his good character and conduct	. 84—88
His senior studentship at Christ Church—a choice of professions: clergyman or physician?—studies in science	. 88—94
The progress of politics under Charles the Second—Locke's friends at court—his appointment as secretary to the ambassador to the elector of Brandenburg	. 94—102
A holiday at Cleve—the town and its inhabitants—the elector's entertainment—a soldiers' feast—dinner with the Franciscan friars—two Lutheran services—a Calvinist divine—catholic ceremonies on Christmas day—a metaphysical disputation—shops and shopping—scientific notes—political affairs—return to England	. 103—121
An offer of diplomatic employment in Spain—Locke's refusal of it—a visit to Somersetshire—the lead mines and miners at Mendip	. 122—127
Medical studies and pursuits—Charles the Second's "dispensation"—a letter of good counsel	. 128—136
Introduction to Lord Ashley—friendship with him and its issue	. 136—144

CHAPTER IV.

EARLY WRITINGS [1660—1667].

Locke's entries in his common-place books and miscellaneous notes and essays	145—147
Writings on ecclesiastical and kindred questions—'Reflections upon the Roman Commonwealth'—an essay on submission to the civil magistrate in matters of religion—'Sacerdos'—'Infallibilis Scripturae Interpres non Necessarius'	147—162
Writings on philosophical questions—virtue and vice—a utilitarian scheme of life	162—165
'An Essay concerning Toleration'—the state of parties and opinions when it was written—the essay; the limits of magisterial authority in respect of (1) speculative opinions and divine worship, (2) practical opinions and actions, and (3) moral virtues and vices; dangerous religionists; the imprudence and folly of persecution	165—194

CHAPTER V.

IN LORD ASHLEY'S FAMILY [1667—1672].

Changes in Locke's plans—his ill-health—his connection with Lord Ashley	195—198
Occupations in Lord Ashley's service as family physician and friend—cure of Lord Ashley's malady—tutor to Anthony Ashley—wife-finding for him—attendance on Lady Dorothy Ashley—opposition at Oxford	198—211
Locke's medical friends; Mapletoft and Sydenham—his own medical practice and his joint work with Sydenham—medical notes and treatises; 'Respirationis Usus;' 'De Arte Medica;' 'Anatomica;' 'Tussis'—a preface for Sydenham—Sydenham's and Locke's method	211—235
The planting of Carolina—Locke's share in 'The Fundamental Constitutions of Carolina' and in the early management of the colony	235—245

Miscellaneous occupations and correspondence between 1667 and 1672— the Royal Society—the origin of ‘An Essay concerning Human Understanding’—letters from David Thomas—a letter to “Dor.”— Mrs. Blomer, her “brother,” and her husband—Mrs. Grigg and her husband—letters to Mapletoft—Locke’s increasing ill-health—a holiday in France	245—269
--	---------

CHAPTER VI.

IN THE EARL OF SHAFTESBURY’S FAMILY [1672—1675].

The antecedents of Shaftesbury’s chancellorship—Buckingham and other members of the Cabal—the treaty of Dover—the declaration of indulgence—the stop of the exchequer	270—278
Locke’s position and duties as secretary of presentations—his connection with political affairs—parliamentary writs during prorogation—the opening of parliament in 1672-3—the test act—Shaftesbury’s dis- missal from the chancellorship—subsequent events	278—285
Locke’s work as secretary to the council of trade and foreign plantations —his farther relations with Carolina—his share in the company of adventurers to the Bahamas	285—294
Pierre Nicole’s ‘Essais de Morale,’ and the ‘Discourses’ translated from them by Locke—Locke’s religious opinions and standard of orthodoxy —some of his clerical friends—Thomas Firmín	294—311
Miscellaneous occupations and correspondence between 1672 and 1675— studies in political economy—correspondence with Mrs. Blomer and Mapletoft—the Royal Society—letters from William Allestree and others—Scandinavian customs and superstitions—Laplanders and Lap- witches—West Indian drugs and other curiosities—a Somersetshire heiress—Locke’s M.B. degree and medical studentship at Oxford.— his annuity from Shaftesbury—increased illness—preparations for going to France	311—336

CHAPTER VII.

TRAVEL AND SOJOURN IN FRANCE [1675—1679].

- Locke's journey through Calais, Poix, Paris, Lyons, Orange, and Nimes, to Montpellier; his observations on the road—visits to Aigues Mortes, Picais, Marseilles, Avignon, and other places—Montpellier in his day—the states-general of Languedoc—government of the province and the city—"making a doctor of physic"—occupations at Montpellier—philosophical studies—notes on imaginary space, extension and distance; experience the means of knowledge; the proper objects and methods of study 337—365
- Locke's new pupil—his journey from Montpellier to Paris—illness on the way—letters to Boyle and Mapletoft—occupations in Paris—its sights and curiosities—Versailles and Fontainebleau—the Countess of Northumberland—Nicolas Thoynard and other friends—three letters to Denis Grenville on recreation and "scrupulosity" . 365—397
- The journey from Paris, through Orleans, Blois, and Angers, to Bordeaux—peasant life in the wine country—letters to Thoynard, Boyle, and Mapletoft—through Montpellier and Lyons to Paris again—return to England 397—409

CHAPTER VIII.

WITH LORD SHAFTESBURY AGAIN [1679—1684].

- The progress of political affairs in England during Locke's absence and after his return—his occupations in connection with public business and in Lord Shaftesbury's service—the parliaments of 1680 and 1681—Locke's share in the education of Shaftesbury's grandson . . 410—424
- Miscellaneous occupations and correspondence—letters to Thoynard—Locke's temper at this time—his income—minor relations with his friends—visits to Oxford and elsewhere 424—445
- Medical pursuits and notes—Locke's account of his fever in 1679—his consumption—'Extracts of Sydenham's Physic Books'—later work with Sydenham 445—456

Locke's 'Defence of Nonconformity'—extracts from his journals ; limits to God's power ; the doctrine of inspiration ; the immortality of the soul—other writings—verses " to a young lady that could never be kept at home" '	456—468
Shaftesbury's conspiracy and death—Locke's later connections with his family—a letter to Thomas Cudworth—acquaintance with Damaris Cudworth—enemies in England—retirement to Holland	468—481
The occasion and method of Locke's expulsion from Christ Church in 1684	481—488

THE LIFE OF JOHN LOCKE.

CHAPTER I.

YOUTH AND ITS SURROUNDINGS.

[1632—1652.]

JOHN LOCKE was born on the 29th of August, 1632; forty-four years after Hobbes, thirty-six after Descartes, twenty-four after Milton, and in the same year as Spinoza; ten years before Newton, and fourteen before Leibnitz.

He died on the 28th of October, 1704. Berkeley was then twenty years old, and Voltaire ten. Hume was born seven years, and Kant twenty, after his death.

He was in his seventeenth year when Charles the First was beheaded, and in his twenty-eighth year when Charles the Second was allowed to assume the English crown. He was sixty-seven when William of Orange was made king, and he lived through two and a half years of the reign of Anne.

His father claimed some sort of cousinship with a John Locke who was mayor of Bristol in 1642, and who was descended from an earlier John Locke, sheriff of London

in 1460, and grandfather of Sir William Locke, the greatest English merchant under Henry the Eighth.¹

But his connection with this family of merchants cannot be clearly traced out. We only know that one branch of it settled in Dorsetshire, and, in the sixteenth century, owned Canning's or Canon's Court, nearly in the middle of the county, and that Edward Locke, a younger member of it, was our John Locke's great-grandfather.²

Edward Locke lived at Brockhampton, a hamlet near to Canning's Court, in the parish of Buckland-Newton, of which he was churchwarden in 1573;³ but his son Nicholas, born in 1574,⁴ migrated early in life from the Dorsetshire hamlet to a Somersetshire village. In 1603, Nicholas Locke married a Frances Lansdon, at Publow,⁵ and there, or at Pensford, hard by, he established himself as a clothier.⁶ Bristol, being then a centre of the woollen trade in the west of England, like Hull and Leeds in the north, gathered in the cloths manufactured in the surrounding towns and villages for shipment to other parts of the country and to continental marts; and contributions were sent to it from Pensford, which

¹ See a long and not very accurate article about the early Lockes in the *Gentleman's Magazine*, vol. lxii. (1792), p. 798.

² "An Account of Mr. Locke's Birth and Pedigree," in the British Museum, *Additional MSS.*, no. 4222, not signed, but in the handwriting of Locke's friend, Edward Clarke, of Chipley, and dated "Chipley, July the 6th, 1735."

³ Buckland Parish Register.

⁴ *Ibid.*

⁵ Publow Parish Register.

⁶ So stated in a long pedigree drawn up and inserted in the Family Bible—now or till lately in the possession of Mr. Tripp, of Winford, Somersetshire—by John at-Neale, whose family was connected with that of the Lockes. This record will in future be referred to as John at-Neale's Pedigree.

Leland, in 1540, termed "a pretty market town, occupied with clothing." Nicholas Locke appears to have been a collector of the stuffs made by his neighbours, and thus a sort of merchant, rather than himself a manufacturer. His trade prospered, and he acquired money in other ways. His first wife died in 1612,¹ and in 1624 he married again—his second wife being a well-to-do widow living at Chew Magna, in the same neighbourhood, whose maiden name was Elizabeth Keene.² After that, it would seem that he lived in the second wife's house. He was described as "of Sutton Wick, in the parish of Chew Magna, clothier;"³ and when he died, in 1648, he was buried in the churchyard of Chew Magna, "under a goodly tomb opposite the belfry door."⁴ Besides other children, he left a daughter Frances, born on the 5th of October, 1604; a son John, born on the 29th of April, 1606; and another son, Peter, born on the 13th of July, 1607.⁵

¹ *Additional MSS.*, no. 28273, in the British Museum; a note-book kept by Locke's father, which will be described hereafter.

² John at-Neale's Pedigree.

³ *Additional MSS.*, no. 4222.

⁴ John at-Neale's Pedigree.

⁵ *Additional MSS.*, no. 28273. Other sons of Nicholas Locke were Edward, born on the 7th of November, 1610, whose will was dated the 24th of April, 1663, and proved in the same year, and Thomas, born on the 12th of February, 1611-12, and whose will, dated the 23rd of November, 1663, was proved on the 4th of February, 1663-4. Peter Locke, who probably carried on his father's business, and became a man of substance, lived at Bishop's Sutton, and was buried in Chew Magna churchyard on the 20th December, 1686. Three of his children died before him. He bequeathed his property to two daughters,—Anne, born in 1641, who in 1670 married Jeremy King, a grocer of Exeter; their son, Peter King, Locke's *protégé*, and afterwards lord charcellor, being the founder of the family now represented by Earl Lovelace; and Elizabeth,

The elder of these two sons was the father of the John Locke whose life is to be recorded in these pages. On the 15th of July, 1630, at the age of twenty-three, his wife being ten years older,¹ he married Agnes or Anne Keene, his step-mother's niece and sister of an Edmund Keene, who, probably, a year or two before, had married his sister Frances.² He did not follow his father's trade in cloth,

who married twice, and had at any rate two sons, Peter Stratton, of Bristol, and John Bonville. Two other cousins of Locke's, Mary Doleman and Anne Hazel, were named by him in his will; but I have not been able to trace their parentage.

¹ The date of her birth—the 14th of April, 1597—is given on a loose memorandum, in the handwriting of Locke's father, but endorsed by him, "Age," which I found among the *Shaftesbury Papers*, series viii., no. 30.

² These Keenes were descended from Edmund Keene, a plumber, of Wrington, who, as it is recorded in John at-Neale's pedigree, owned "the house where he dwelt, by the hatch on the north side"—which is interesting to us as being afterwards the birth-place of John Locke—and whose widow, living on till 1636, or later, was the owner of much property at Wrington. The Edmund Keene who married Frances Locke was a tanner by trade. Among other evidences of his good social position, we hear of his purchasing land at Wrington worth 330*l.* under a deed that was executed by John Keene, his brother, and John Locke, his brother-in-law, as attorneys. This information, derived from family documents, has been kindly communicated to me by Charles Jackson, Esq., of Doncaster, to whom I am also indebted for the following correct copy of a quaint postscript—of which an incorrect version appeared in *Notes and Queries* for 27th May, 1854,—appended to a letter addressed in 1754, by Mrs. Frances Watkins, the second Edmund Keene's granddaughter, then about eighty years old, to her son Joseph Watkins of Clapton. It will be noticed that the old lady wrote "Peter" when she should have written "John" in the first line:—

"I am allied to Mr. Locke thus: His father, Mr. Peter Locke, and my grandmother was brother and sister, consequently my father and the great Locke first cousins. My grandfather's sister and Mr. Locke's father produced this wonder of the world. To make you more sensible of it, a Keene married a Locke, and a Locke married a Keene. My aunt Keene was a most beautiful woman, as was the family, and my uncle Locke an extreme

but was educated for the law, and made for himself a good position as a country attorney, though we are told that "he inherited from his father a much better estate than he left to his son."¹ He was clerk to the justices of the peace for the district of Somersetshire in which he resided,² the chief of whom were Francis Baber, of Chew Magna, who died in 1643, and Alexander Popham, of Houndstreet, who died in 1669. Popham owned considerable property in Somersetshire, especially about Pensford and eastward of it towards Bath. With him the young attorney was connected, during at least twenty years, as agent and general adviser;³ and in this work, as well as in the performance of his other avocations, he seems to have had large and useful occupation throughout the chief part of his life.⁴

wise man. So much for genealogy. My Lord Chancellor King was allied thus near. I forget whether his mother was a Keene or a Locke. I had all my information from my aunt Darby. Mr. Locke had no advantage in his person, but a very fine gentleman. From foreign courts they use to write, 'For John Locke, Esq., in England.'

¹ MSS. in the *Remonstrants' Library* at Amsterdam; Lady Masham to Jean le Clerc, 12th Jan., 1704-5.

² In *Additional MSS.*, no. 4222, Edward Clarke speaks of him as "clerk to Mr. Baber;" but from the note-book presently to be referred to it is evident that his employment was more general.

³ Anthony Wood says that he was Popham's "steward or court-keeper" — '*Athenæ Oxonienses*' (ed. Bliss, 1820), vol. iv., col. 638.

⁴ Of the varied nature of his occupations some welcome illustrations are extant in a limp vellum-covered volume, in which he was in the habit of entering all sorts of business details, precedents and other memoranda between the years 1629 and 1655, which is now in the British Museum, *Additional MSS.*, no. 28273. It contains, for instance, forms of the oaths requisite to be taken in courts of law on different occasions, and notes likely to be helpful to a young attorney and land-agent. We find in it entries of bailments and bindings over of prosecutors in cases of felony which occurred in the neighbourhood of Pensford, for the assizes of 1630,

His quiet pursuits as a lawyer were disturbed, however, and his prosperity was permanently impaired, by the outburst of the civil war between Charles the First and the Long Parliament. "In the year 1634 the writs for ship-money began," says the old chronicler of Bristol;¹ in that sentence pithily indicating the commencement of those quarrels which were nowhere more vigorous—as regards ship-money at any rate—than in the great western sea-port of England and in the neighbouring towns that thrived by its enterprise. The new and unjust imposts at first gave the elder Locke some work to do in the way of his own calling. He had to assist either in levying the taxes, or in showing what were the amounts claimed proportionately from all the inhabitants of his district.²

at Bath, Taunton, Bridgewater, and Wells. We have notices of the appointment at Bath, in 1631, of overseers of the cloth trade for Chew, Kainsham, Publow, Weston, Frome, and other places. We have an enumeration of the tithings in the hundreds of Chew, Chewton and Kainsham, and a statement of sums paid by each of these tithings, on the occasion of James the First's subsidy, which had for pretext the proposed war with Spain in 1623. We have the particulars of other rates and assessments, some evidently quoted as precedents for certain proceedings in which he was to take part, others being records of proceedings in which he had been himself concerned. We have also a list of the justices and of the grand-jurymen employed at the Bath assizes in July, 1637; and, as entries of a more personal nature, we have a statement of "Rent to my landlord, Colonel Alexander Popham, out of the three tenements I hold in Publow, and the lives thereon at the time of their obtaining," and "A receipt for rent at Publow, 3 October, and 11 December, 1638." Most of the entries are evidently in the elder Locke's own lawyer-like handwriting. Others, especially those of a miscellaneous nature, near the end of the book, are in other handwritings, some in that of his famous son.

¹ Ricart's 'Calendar,' quoted by Seyer, 'Memoirs of Bristol' (1821), vol. ii., p. 289.

² In his memorandum book he entered a precise statement of the number and proportion of the shipping belonging to Bristol and all other parts

And as soon as the time for yielding, however sullenly, to the king's illegal demands was over, he prepared to take his share in active opposition to them. On the 3rd of April, 1642, in the parish church of Publow, he publicly announced his assent to the protest that the Long Parliament had made the year before,¹ and a few weeks after that declaration he took the field as captain of a troop of horse in the regiment of volunteers raised by his friend and employer, Alexander Popham, now Colonel Popham, in the parliamentary army.²

The rebellion in the west had broken out. The Marquis of Hertford and Lord Paulet were sent down to quell it; but Popham's regiment, aided by some other volunteers, drove them back in August, and, for a time, kept Somersetshire clear of royalists.³ But Bristol was not quite so brave or steadfast as some other towns, and when in September Popham sought permission to lodge within its walls five hundred of his horse, in order to strengthen its defences, he was refused admission, and he had to wait two months for the arrival of more regular troops from London, when the gates were forced open under the

of the kingdom, and of the contributions to be made accordingly by the 1st of March, 1635-6. That entry is followed by an enumeration of all the rateable persons in Publow and the neighbouring parishes, and of the amounts of ship-money levied against each of those persons—8s. 9d. being charged against the elder Locke himself, the largest item except four out of the fifty-seven of which the 9l. claimed from Publow was made up.

¹ *Additional MSS.*, no. 28273. Next before this entry is "a particular how each tithing within the hundreds of Chew, Chewton, and Kainsham stands charged for the relief of his Majesty's army in the northern part of the kingdom," in respect of the subsidy appointed in 1641.

² *Additional MSS.*, no. 4222; Seyer, vol. ii., p. 310.

³ Clarendon, 'History of the Rebellion' (1849), vol. ii., p. 325; Seyer, vol. ii., p. 310.

leadership of Colonel Thomas Essex.¹ In January he was sent with his regiment to relieve Exeter; but, having done that, he returned next month, and remained there for some time as chief adviser of Colonel Nathaniel Fiennes, now in charge of the city.²

The parliamentary cause, however, was not destined to prosper in the west. During the first half of 1643 the royalist party, with superior forces and better generalship on its side, gained ground in nearly all the districts outside of Bristol. In Cornwall and Devonshire, Lord Hertford and Prince Maurice carried all before them. Maurice entered Somerset in June, and scoured all the country about Wrington, Pensford, and the other haunts of the Locke family, while Sir William Waller was hurrying down to meet him. Waller was reinforced at Bath by Popham's regiment and other supplies from Bristol, and with proper management might have defeated the enemy. But, after winning one battle, at Lansdown near Bath, on the 5th of July, he allowed time for fresh royalist troops to arrive, and then, rashly accepting a challenge to renew the fight, was altogether worsted near Devizes on the 13th. His infantry was cut up, and his cavalry, with Colonel Popham and Captain Locke among its officers, was put to the rout. A fortnight later, after a siege of a day and a half, Bristol surrendered to Prince Rupert.

What became of Captain Locke and his immediate leader after the catastrophe at Devizes is not recorded. They were not in Bristol when it was taken by Prince Rupert in July, 1643: there is nothing to show that they were engaged in its recapture under Fairfax and Cromwell

¹ Barrett, 'History of Bristol' (1789), pp. 225, 226.

² *Ibid.*; Seyer, vol. ii., pp. 315, 322, 329.

in September, 1645. We may reasonably assume that further work was found for them to do in the ensuing years, but we only know that they were on active service as soldiers from before midsummer in 1642 till after midsummer in 1643. That Colonel Popham continued to be a good patriot is proved by the little that we know about his later history.¹ That he was not a very good soldier may be inferred from the silence of the chroniclers concerning any later enterprises that he may have been concerned in. And that Captain Locke followed his steps, as a soldier no less than a patriot, may also be inferred.

By the "public calamities" of the civil war, we are told, Captain Locke was a "private sufferer."² It seems, indeed, that he was nearly ruined, and, as soon as his ordinary avocations could be resumed, he had, in order partly to retrieve his position, to add to them fresh work of a kindred sort, as clerk of the sewers for the county of Somerset.³ It was well for him and his family, however, that he was able, after some five or six years' inter-

¹ Popham entered the Long Parliament as member for Bath in October, 1645, immediately after the re-capture of Bristol. He was not in the Barebones Parliament, but he represented Bath again in Cromwell's Parliament of 1654, the county of Somerset in the Parliament of 1656, and the borough of Minehead in Richard Cromwell's Parliament of 1658. (Cobbett, 'Parliamentary History,' vol. ii., col. 616; vol. iii., cols. 1431, 1481, and 1534.)

² MSS. in the Remonstrants' Library; Lady Masham to Jean le Clerc, 12th Jan., 1704-5.

³ Additional MSS., no. 4222. In his memorandum book, *Additional MSS.*, no. 28273, entries begin to be made again in 1648, and some of them indicate that he was still specially interested in the business of the civil war. Thus we have the particulars of "a rate for raising 41l. 0s. 3d. per mensem in the hundred of Kainsham, for General Fairfax's army," in 1648, as well as some account of a "purblind, partial, and innovated rate" levied in Kainsham hundred,—the hundred in which the parish of Publow was situ-

ruption, to settle down in his old ways of living. However praiseworthy and however necessary may have been

ated,—dated the 24th of September, 1649. The last entry upon business matters is dated 1655.

The later pages of this memorandum-book are chiefly occupied with medical prescriptions and other recipes, some evidently written by the older Locke himself. One of the recipes has the following heading: "The weapon-salve, and the use thereof, as it was sent unto me as a most excellent and rare secret, from my cousin, Alderman John Locke, of Bristol, in his letter dated 5th April, 1650." Another and very strange recipe is apparently in the juvenile handwriting of his famous son:—

"To make Capon-Water.

"Take three pints of sack; a red capon, feather pulled alive; take out the gut and quarter him, and beat it all to pieces;—it must not be washed. Then take half a pound of dates, and one pound of raisins of the sun; stone them both; one handful of pimpernel; half a handful of rosemary; one handful of hill-thyme; one handful of penny-royal; wash them and dry them in a cloth and cut them. Take all these, and put them in a clean earthen pot all night. Next morning put them in a cold still, and still it. Take a quarter of a pound of white sugar candy, and put it in the glass that takes the water, and you shall take three pints of water."

This next recipe is more interesting as being signed "J. L., Ox: " and being probably, if not of our John Locke's own devising, the one that he used while he was an Oxford student:—

"To make Shining Ink.

- "Half a pint of wort :
- Half a quarter of a pound of galls :
- Half an ounce of copperas :
- Half a quarter of an ounce of gum arabic.

Put together; set over the fire till so hot you cannot well endure your finger therein, stirring it always. Let it stand 7 or 8 days, often stirring it. Then strain out the ink. You may double or treble the quantity of the gum, as you shall see cause."

Besides the business concerns and the recipes, this curious memorandum-book of Locke's father is interspersed with several entries on theological and ecclesiastical topics. There is a long transcript, for instance, from Archbishop Ussher on "the liturgy and episcopal government required by

his patriotic work as a soldier under the Long Parliament, it had brought trouble enough upon the little household at Pensford into which, nearly ten years before the civil war broke out, JOHN LOCKE had been born.

Pensford is a straggling village about six miles from Bristol, on the road to Shepton Mallet; the part of it lying on the left-hand side of the road being in the parish of Publow, and stretching up towards Publow village, a mile nearer to Bristol. The house which belonged to old Nicholas Locke until his death in 1648, but which seems to have been long previously occupied by his son, was situated in this eastern part of the village, with a field that is still known as Locke's Mead in its rear. It was thus

the house of parliament in anno 1640," together with "copia actus locationis mensae Dominic in ecclesia St. Gregorii, Civitatis London." There are also entries "de predestinatione," and so forth. Then we find a curious string of questions on "propositiones catholicae"—whether all that are baptised are regenerated? whether those that die unbaptised may be saved? whether bowing towards an altar is lawful? whether a minister may hold more benefices than one? whether the order of bishops is of divine institution? whether bowing at the name of Jesus is a pious ceremony? whether a minister may with a safe conscience administer the sacrament to one not kneeling? whether Christ did "locally" descend into hell? whether the minister's pardon in remitting sins is only "declarative"? whether in the election of ministers the voice of the people is required? whether the church of Rome is a true church? To these knotty questions no answers were given by the writer. Did he set them down, in the days of puritan supremacy, as remembrances of the Laudian tyranny from which England had so recently escaped? or, having taken his share in the grand effort to save the country from papistical idolatry and "divine right" oppression, was he himself beginning to find out, with Milton, that "new presbyter is but old priest writ long," and to think that perhaps there was something to be said for as well as against the ritual and the ecclesiasticism that were just then being ruthlessly trampled under foot?

in Publow parish, although in Pensford village. In formal documents the Lockes are said to be "of Publow," in informal documents "of Pensford."

Some ten or eleven miles to the west of this locality, and about as far distant from Bristol, in a south-westerly direction, is the smaller village of Wrington, where in 1630 the elder John Locke was married to Agnes Keene. There, to the north of the church, and built up against the churchyard wall, is a small, thatched, two-storied house—the nearest to it of two that are set in one block—in which the young wife's grandfather had resided, and which was now occupied by one of her brothers.¹ In this house John Locke was born on the 29th of August, 1632, and baptised on the same day.²

Of his early childhood we know nothing; but we may infer that it was passed mainly at Pensford, with occasional visits to Wrington, where his mother's kinsfolk resided, and where his father's sister Frances was living with her husband Edmund Keene, his uncle by the mother's side; and to Sutton Wick, nearly midway between Pensford and Wrington, where his grandfather

¹ John at-Neale's Pedigree.

² Wrington Parish Register; *Shaftesbury Papers*, series viii., no. 30. Tradition adds—perhaps because it was not thought quite satisfactory to connect such a great man's first appearance in the world with such "a small plain apartment, having few indications of former respectability" (Rutter, 'Delineations of Somerset,' p. xxii.)—that the occurrence in this place was accidental, as "the celebrated philosopher's mother, travelling in these parts, was here taken in labour, and constrained to take up her residence" (Collinson, 'History of Somerset,' vol. ii., p. 209). Edward Clarke reported, evidently in error, that Locke's mother, "intending to lie in at Wrington with her friends, was surprised on her way thither, and, putting into a little house on Broadwell Down, was delivered there" (*Additional MSS.*, no. 4222).

resided in the house of his second wife. Thomas, the only other child of John and Agnes Locke, was born at Pensford, and baptised on the 9th of August, 1637.¹

After that event we lose trace of Locke's mother. All our information about her is contained in a single vague sentence, written long afterwards by Locke's most intimate friend during the last years of his life: "What I remember him to have said of his mother expressed her to be a very pious woman and affectionate mother."² She probably died young, perhaps too early to leave any vivid impression on her son's memory. It may be assumed that she died before her husband made his will in 1660, as she is not named therein.

There can be little doubt, at any rate, that Locke held himself especially indebted to his father for the healthy influences that surrounded his childhood. "From Mr. Locke I have often heard of his father, that he was a man of parts," said the friend just quoted from. "Mr. Locke never mentioned him but with great respect and affection. His father used a conduct towards him when young that he often spoke of afterwards with great approbation. It was the being severe to him by keeping him in much awe and at a distance when he was a boy, but relaxing, still by degrees, of that severity as he grew up to be a man, till, he being become capable of it, he lived perfectly with him as a friend. And I remember he has told me that his father, after he was a man, solemnly asked his pardon for having struck him once in a passion when he was a boy."³ A parent who apologised for one such offence

¹ Publow Parish Register.

² MSS. in the Remonstrants' Library; Lady Masham to Jean le Clerc, 12 Jan. 1704-5.

³ *Ibid.* The reader will not fail to notice, in Locke's omission, in his re-

would not be likely to have thus offended much more than once.

That Locke, when he was grown up, approved of the home discipline to which he had been subjected as a boy, is the best proof that the discipline, however severe it may have been, was not cruel. He generalised his own experience of parental treatment into a rule for all parents. "Those that intend ever to govern their children," he said, "should begin it whilst they are very little, and look that they perfectly comply with the will of their parents. Would you have your son obedient to you when past a child? Be sure, then, to establish the authority of a father as soon as he is capable of submission and can understand in whose power he is. If you would have him stand in awe of you, imprint it in his infancy, and, as he approaches more to a man, admit him nearer to your familiarity: so shall you have him your obedient subject, as is fit, whilst he is a child, and your affectionate friend when he is a man. For methinks they mightily misplace the treatment due to their children, who are indulgent and familiar when they are little, but severe to them, and keep them at a distance, when they are grown up. For liberty and indulgence can do no good to children; their want of judgment makes them stand in need of restraint and discipline. And, on the contrary, imperiousness and severity is but an ill way of treating men who have reason of their own to guide them, unless you have a mind to make your children, when

mains, of all allusion to his mother, and in his approval of his father's educational method, the first indications of a curious parallelism, not constant, but often recurring, between the training and conditions of Locke's life, as well as his philosophical temper and work, and those of his great successor, John Stuart Mill—separated, of course, by nearly two centuries.

grown up, weary of you, and secretly to say within themselves, 'When will you die, father?'"¹

The home duties of John Locke the elder were, as we have seen, seriously disturbed during his son's early boyhood. The disturbances, however, contributed in one respect at least to the lad's education. "I no sooner perceived myself in the world," he wrote in 1660, "but I found myself in a storm which has lasted almost hitherto."² The storm began to show itself almost as soon as he could prattle. It raged fiercely all round Pensford, and swept past it more than once, during the years in which he was learning not only to write English and master the rudiments of Latin grammar, but also to begin thinking for himself, in boyish way, on some of the great questions of the time. Those questions must have been forced upon him, child as he was, by the fact that his father was now serving in the army that was setting Charles the First at defiance.

In 1646 he became a Westminster boy. How much schoolboy lore he acquired while he was at home or near it we do not know. It would seem that, before being admitted to Westminster, he must have received a better education than his father, even had he not been so busily engaged elsewhere, could himself have been able to give him; and, under ordinary conditions, we might fairly expect that he would have been sent for a few years, after he was ten or eleven, to Bristol Grammar School; but the disturbed state of Bristol at that time, violently seized and violently ruled by royalists till it was violently wrested from them, rendered that almost impossible.

¹ 'Some Thoughts concerning Education' (1692), § 40.

² Lord King, 'The Life of John Locke, with Extracts from his Correspondence, Journals, and Common-place Books' (1829), p. 6.

If not in schoolboy lore, however, it is evident that in other ways he must have been carefully trained from infancy by his father, or by some one in a father's place. The rare modesty, gentleness and truthfulness of disposition and temperament for which he was remarkable all through his later life, the eager spirit of inquiry, the singular capacity of unbiassed judgment and the unvarying love of justice for which he was yet more remarkable, cannot but have grown from seeds planted while he was very young. Some millions of children may have had quite as good early training as was received by John Locke, without one of them growing to be such an one as John Locke was; but without good early training it is impossible that he could have grown to be what he became.

It was through the influence of Colonel Alexander Popham that young Locke was admitted to Westminster School.¹ The date is not recorded, but it can be inferred with some certainty. As the statutes of the school direct that no boy shall be elected a king's scholar after the age of fifteen, he cannot—unless the irregularities incident to the civil war rendered possible an exception to the rule—have been thus elected later than 1647; and, as no boy can be placed on the foundation before he has been at least a year in the school, he cannot have entered it after 1646. But he is not likely, especially at the instance of Colonel Popham, to have been admitted before that year. In the earlier period of the civil war the dean and chapter of Westminster had so stoutly committed themselves to the royalist cause, that, when the Roundheads

¹ *Additional MSS.*, no. 4222.

began to triumph, especially after the Assembly of Divines had commenced to hold its session in Westminster Abbey, they deemed it expedient to keep out of the way. Accordingly, there being no one in responsible charge either of the abbey or of the school, the Long Parliament passed an ordinance on the 18th of November, 1645, entrusting the management of both institutions to a committee of its own way of thinking, and on the members of this committee devolved the share of power in electing scholars which had previously appertained to the dean and chapter.¹ They naturally elected promising youths of their own party; and during the few years following their appointment the school that had hitherto been appropriated exclusively by royalists was opened to the sons of puritans. We can readily understand how Popham, entering parliament as member for Bath in October, 1645,² was able to obtain a nomination for the son of his friend and agent in Somersetshire, and we may fairly assume that young Locke became a Westminster boy early in 1646.

Westminster School, growing out of a much older appendage of the ancient abbey, had been formally established about a hundred years before Locke was admitted into it. Henry the Eighth had made provision by charter for a school to contain forty boys, and soon after her accession Queen Elizabeth had reorganized it under a new charter, which, in addition to the forty foundationers, or king's scholars, provided for the education of eighty other boys,—some as pensionarii, resident with the masters and ushers of the school, or with the

¹ The ordinance is cited by Widmore, 'History of Westminster Abbey' (1751), p. 214.

² See note on p. 9.

dean and prebendaries of the abbey; others as oppidani, town boys living with their parents or other kinsfolk; others as peregrini, country boys boarding with any neighbouring householders who would undertake the charge. Queen Elizabeth's charter is still the basis of the school establishment, but even before Locke's day the number of outside boys had been allowed greatly to exceed the prescribed limit of eighty. From these outside boys, and as far as convenient from the sons of tenants of the chapter estates—nominally by merit, but really very often by favour—the king's scholars were elected at Whitsuntide, generally about ten each year. At the end of four years the most suitable were transferred to the universities, there to be provided with a free education during seven years more; three being usually elected each Whitsuntide to junior studentships at Christ Church College, Oxford, and three being sent to Trinity College, Cambridge.¹

Locke, probably, having begun school-life at Westminster as a peregrinus in 1646, was made a king's scholar in 1647. If the rules and usages of the school were strictly conformed to in his case—and we must never forget that these were years in which strict conformity to rules and usages could not be relied upon, and that they were, as regards religious affairs, compulsorily broken through—he had, before he could become even a peregrinus, to prove that he was of good morals and of teachable mind, and well grounded in the rudiments of knowledge. Before he could become a king's scholar it was requisite that he should pass a stiff examination in

¹ The Statutes of the Collegiate Church of St. Peter, Westminster, printed, so far as relates to the school, in the Appendix to the Report of the Cathedral and Collegiate Church Commission, 1854.

Latin, if not in Greek as well, and in "at least eight parts of grammar," and also that he should be able "to write at any rate tolerably well." That done, he was entitled to instruction and residence without charge, and to an annual allowance of 13s. 4*d.* for "livery," and 60s. 10*d.* for "commons," with some extra allowance for luxuries on festivals and holidays.¹

Locke passed six years in Westminster School, a year longer than the ordinary curriculum. At Whitsuntide in 1652 he obtained a junior studentship at Christ Church, Oxford.² We have no direct information concerning his life and occupations during the interval, but it is not difficult to understand something about them.³

The famous Dr. Richard Busby was head master of Westminster in his day, having been appointed to the post in 1638, and holding it until his death in 1695; and under his rule there was no relaxation in the discipline of the school, albeit some change in theological

¹ The Statutes of the Collegiate Church of St. Peter, Westminster.

² Welch, 'Alumni Westmonasteriensis' (1852), p. 139. Though only Welch's name appears on the title-page of this second edition, it owes most of its value to the copious additions by its editor, Mr. C. B. Phillimore.

³ John Dryden, the poet, and Robert South, the witty preacher and scurrilous theologian, were Locke's schoolfellows, and his seniors in the school by a year; but if he had much intimacy with either of them at Westminster, it was certainly not continued in after-life. Among the youths with whom he did maintain friendly relations in later days, and with whom we shall accordingly make some acquaintance hereafter, were William Godolphin, elder brother of the more famous Sidney Godolphin, and destined to acquire some small distinction in the world of politics, Thomas Blomer, who became a clergyman, and Richard Lower and Walter Needham, who became successful physicians. John Mapletoft, another doctor of repute, was afterwards one of Locke's most intimate friends; but as he left Westminster for Cambridge in 1648, they probably at this time knew little of one another.

training and forms of religion, during the Commonwealth period. There was more hearing of sermons and prayers, but not less attendance to the school routine.

The boys rose, dressed themselves, and attended prayers before six o'clock in the morning, when the school-work began. Two hours were spent in Greek and Latin grammar repetitions, in extempore Latin paraphrases and expositions by the elder scholars of passages given to them out of Greek or Latin authors, and in repetitions by the younger scholars of passages that they had learnt overnight, under the correction and instruction of the masters. An hour was then allowed them in which to prepare other exercises, and between nine and eleven they were examined in prose and verse composition, still of course in Greek and Latin, were called upon to translate *viva voce* passages from English authors into Latin or Greek, according to their capacities, and listened to their masters' expositions of classical authors on which they were to be examined in the afternoon. Two hours were devoted to dinner and such pastime as the reading of Latin manuscripts, in order that they might be familiar with mediæval handwriting. Between one and three they were examined in the passages previously expounded to them, and exercised in "construing and other grammatical ways, examining all the rhetorical figures, and translating out of verse into prose, or out of prose into verse, out of Greek into Latin, or out of Latin into Greek." Between three and four they were allowed to walk about in the recreation ground; and after that, till supper time, they were chiefly employed in translating Greek or Latin prose into English prose, or Greek or Latin verse into English verse, and in preparing their exercises for the morrow. So four days of the week were filled. Fridays were set apart for re-

petitions, and Saturdays for Greek and Latin declamations. In the upper forms, part of the time was devoted to the study of Hebrew and Arabic, instead of the classical languages, and during the summer, after supper, a little elementary geography was taught.¹

With such a wonderful school diet, it is not strange that a good many Westminster boys should have become either pedants or dolts. "I heard and saw such exercises," wrote Evelyn, on the 13th of May, 1661, "at the election of scholars at Westminster School to be sent to the university, in Latin, Greek, Hebrew, and Arabic, in themes and extemporaneous verses, as wonderfully astonished me in such youths, some of them not above twelve or thirteen years of age. Pity it is that what they attain here so ripely, they either do not retain, or do not improve more considerably when they come to be men; though many of them do."

John Locke was one of those who did improve in learning when he came to be a man; but very little of his eminence can have been due to the excessive quantity of indigestible scholarship that was forced upon him in his youth, and long after he had left school he took occasion, in his 'Thoughts concerning Education,' to condemn the teaching and the method of teaching to which he had been subjected. "A good part of the learning now in fashion in the schools of Europe, and that goes ordinarily into the round of education," he wrote, "a gentleman may in good measure be unfurnished with,

¹ See a long and graphic account of his studies, written by a Westminster scholar of the generation before Locke's, quoted in 'The Public Schools' (1867), a volume full of interesting gossip about Westminster, Winchester, Shrewsbury, Harrow, and Rugby, which first appeared in *Blackwood's Magazine*.

without any great disparagement to himself or prejudice to his affairs.”¹

These ‘Thoughts concerning Education’ furnish, by inference, if not directly, so many illustrations of Locke’s own schoolboy experiences, that it is proper here to quote a few of them, though the terms in which they are expressed give utterance to the ripe wisdom of a full-grown man, rather than the raw judgment of a youth of nineteen.

He of course approved of classical studies, if there was time for them, and if they were to be put to any good use hereafter. But he objected that “custom, which prevails over everything, has made it so much a part of education, that even those children are whipped to it, and made spend many hours of their precious time uneasily in Latin, who, after they are once gone from school, are never to have more to do with it as long as they live.” “Can there,” he asked, “be anything more ridiculous than that a father should waste his own money and his son’s time in setting him to learn the Roman language, when at the same time he designs him for a trade wherein he, having no use of Latin, fails not to forget that little which he brought from school, and which, ’tis ten to one, he abhors for the ill-usage it procured him?” And he objected yet more to the way in which it was taught. “How necessary soever Latin be to some, and is thought to be to others to whom it is of no manner of use or service,” he said, “yet the ordinary way of learning it in a grammar-school is that which, having had thoughts about, I cannot be forward to encourage.”²

¹ ‘Some Thoughts concerning Education’ (1692), § 94.

² *Ibid.*, §§ 164, 165.

The interminable study of grammatical rules he strongly condemned; yet more the custom of compelling boys to write themes and verses in Latin. "Do but consider," he said in words that were evidently prompted by his own experience, "what 'tis, in making a theme, that a young lad is employed about. 'Tis to make a speech on some Latin saying, as 'Omnia vincit amor,' or 'Non licet in bello bis peccare,' etc. And here the poor lad, who wants knowledge of those things he is to speak of, which is to be had only from time and observation, must set his invention on the rack to say something where he knows nothing; which is a sort of Egyptian tyranny, to bid them make bricks who have not yet any of the materials; and therefore it is usual in such cases for the poor children to go to those of higher forms with this petition, 'Pray give me a little sense!' which, whether it be more reasonable, or more ridiculous, is not easy to determine. Would you not think him a little cracked who would require another to make an argument on a moot point who understands nothing of our laws? And what, I pray, do schoolboys understand concerning those matters which are used to be proposed to them in their themes as subjects to discourse on, to whet and exercise their fancies?"¹

Locke of course disapproved yet more of Latin verse-writing than of Latin theme-writing, and of writing themes and verses in Greek yet more than in Latin.

"Of another thing very ordinary in the method of grammar-schools," he said, "I see no use at all, unless it be to baulk young lads in the way of learning languages, which, in my opinion, should be made as easy and pleasant as may be, and that which is painful in it as much as

¹ 'Some Thoughts concerning Education,' § 171.

possible quite removed." "That which I mean here, and complain of, is their being forced to learn by heart great parcels of the authors which are taught them; wherein I can discover no advantage at all, especially to the business they are upon. Languages are to be learnt only by reading and talking, and not by scraps of authors got by heart, which, when a man's head is stuffed with, he has got the furniture of a pedant, and 'tis the ready way to make him one, than which there is nothing less becoming a gentleman. For what can be more ridiculous than to mix the rich and handsome thoughts and sayings of others with a deal of poor stuff of his own, which is thereby the more exposed, and has no other grace in it, nor will otherwise recommend the speaker, than a threadbare russet coat would, that was set off with large patches of scarlet and glittering brocade? Indeed, where a passage comes in the way, whose matter is worth remembrance, and the expression of it very close and excellent (as there are many such in the ancient authors), it may not be amiss to lodge it in the mind of young scholars, and with such admirable strokes of those great masters sometimes exercise the memory of schoolboys. But their learning of their lessons by heart, as they happen to fall out in their books, without choice or distinction, I know not what it serves for but to misspend their time and pains, and give them a disgust and aversion to their books, wherein they find nothing but useless trouble."¹

We should not be at all justified in assuming that Locke held in 1652, when he left school, the opinions about school-teaching that he published in 1692; but it is worth remembering that his eminently reasonable views as a man were based on his own experience as a boy, and

¹ 'Some Thoughts concerning Education,' § 175.

those views furnish the best proof that, however just was his condemnation of the teaching provided for him, it did no great harm to him at any rate. Though as a second or third form boy he may have begged his elders to give him a little sense, he must have had a good stock of his own; and however much his head may have been stuffed with "scraps of authors got by heart," they never gave to the outcome of his brain the appearance of scarlet patches upon threadbare russet.

It is impossible, however, that all the instruction imparted to him at Westminster can have been of the old-fashioned pedagogic sort. If Dr. Busby taught him nothing but Latin and Greek, there was much else that he could not fail to learn.

He was within hearing of the noise, if not an actual eye-witness, of the exploit for which the 30th of January, 1648-9, will ever be one of the most memorable days in English history, the day on which a king professing to reign by divine right was executed in Whitehall Palace Yard as a traitor to the commonwealth entrusted to his keeping; and, during the two or three years before and the two or three years after that great crisis, he was very near to the centre of the English Rebellion, and must have heard much, and doubtless thought much, about all these strange and solemn doings. The great political events of the time must have conveyed many memorable lessons to the schoolboy whose quiet cloisters were in such immediate proximity to the very spring and centre of their action. By listeners in peaceful nooks and corners the sounds that reach them from the bustling outside world are sometimes more plainly heard than by those among the crowd whose voices help to make the turmoil.

CHAPTER II.

STUDENT LIFE AT OXFORD.

[1652—1660.]

HAVING been elected to a studentship at Christ Church, Oxford, at Whitsuntide, 1652, Locke proceeded in the autumn to claim his right of admission to the university, and matriculated on the 27th of November. His name appears under that date in the records of the college, with the description "generosi filius," son of a gentleman.¹

Though at Westminster School he had been very near to the centre of all the political and religious excitement of the day, he could hardly have had a quieter corner in all England in which to learn how to talk Latin as fluently as his mother-tongue, and to acquaint himself with all the pedantic rules of grammar which had been bequeathed by the mediæval schoolmen. In becoming a student at Oxford he entered a much larger and more boisterous world.

When, in the autumn of 1642, Charles the First, kept out of London, found shelter in Oxford—which he had just before inundated by the nomination of four hundred and two "courtiers, nobles, and gentlemen," and other

¹ *Christ Church College Entry Book*. The common statement that Locke went to Oxford in 1651 may be partly excused on the ground that he was elected to his studentship in the fourth (*i.e.* Trinity) term of the academical year beginning in 1651.

favourites, to degrees in arts, laws, physic, and divinity¹—the town became the head-quarters of the royalist forces, and the university, by no means so devoted to learning under Charles as in previous times, very nearly abandoned learning altogether. Out of the hundred students of Christ Church in 1644, twenty were serving in Charles's army, while the number of royalist volunteers from many of the other colleges was very much greater;² and nearly all the men of anti-royalist sympathies who had remained through the Laudian persecutions were constrained to leave now that Oxford was little other than a military camp. When the town surrendered to the puritans in 1646, according to the testimony of such a devoted royalist as Anthony Wood, "there was scarce the face of an university left, all things being out of order and disturbed;" and it is not strange that the new masters, while conceding to the inhabitants freedom from "molestations" as regards fines, taxes, and the like, should have stipulated that these exemptions were not to prevent "any reformation there intended by the parliament."³ The reformation not only intended but actually effected by the parliament, honest and praiseworthy, though perhaps somewhat too roughly carried out, was such that the royalists declared that "hell was broke loose upon them."⁴

During the civil war the dean of Christ Church, also vice-chancellor of the university, was Dr. Samuel Fell, an extreme supporter of the royalist cause. For two

¹ Wood, 'History and Antiquities of Oxford' (ed. Gutch, 1792), vol. ii., p. 455; 'Fasti Oxonienses' (ed. Bliss, 1820), part ii., cols. 7-55.

² Burrows, 'Worthies of All Souls' (1874), p. 177.

³ Rushworth, 'Historical Collections,' part iv. (1701), vol. vi., p. 283.

⁴ Burrows, p. 178.

years after the surrender of Oxford, he resisted and encouraged others to resist all the efforts of the Long Parliament to bring about the desired changes, until in April, 1648, it was found necessary to imprison him in London, and to appoint "a visitation" for the purpose of bringing the university to order. The parliamentary visitors formally deprived Dr. Fell of his academical offices, and also dismissed several of his associates. Dr. Reynolds replaced the deposed dean and vice-chancellor, and under him the real supremacy of the parliament began at Oxford.

All the fellows, tutors, chaplains, students, and even servants, who refused to acknowledge the new authority, were dismissed, and out of the members of a dozen colleges, concerning which alone precise information is extant, there were less than one-third who submitted to two-thirds who would not submit—a hundred and eighty-seven conformists, as against three hundred and eighty-two non-conformists. In Christ Church the proportion of one to two was exact, thirty-five remaining and seventy going.¹ The vacant places, we are told by the royalist historian of Oxford, were filled up "from among the candidates who came trooping in from Cambridge, and by poor curates and schoolmasters from the country, of whom some had been married and had buried their wives."² From whatever source they came, however, some of the new students were men of exemplary character and unusual talent, men who helped to give a new life to the university of Oxford and to English learning.

Dr. Reynolds's reign at Oxford was not a long one.

¹ Burrows, p. 192, citing the very important register of the Parliamentary Visitors, from the MS. in the Bodleian Library.

² Wood, 'History and Antiquities of Oxford,' vol. ii., p. 634.

Within less than three years, being called upon to sign the pledge of obedience to Cromwell's government, and to acknowledge no allegiance to king or house of lords, he refused, or prevaricated. For that he was dismissed, and, on the 18th of March, 1650-1, Dr. John Owen was appointed dean of Christ Church in his stead.¹ The new appointment, and what followed upon it, were memorable.

Owen was born in 1616. As a child he showed so much ability that he was admitted a student of Queen's College, Oxford, when he was only twelve years old, and he was a master of arts at the age of nineteen. Soon after that, being a zealous independent, he was driven from the university, and as soon as the civil war broke out he began to make some stir as a supporter of it on the ground of religious liberty. He preached before parliament in April, 1646, and he was selected to perform a like office on the 31st of January, 1648-9, the day after Charles the First's execution. His discourse then, considering the occasion on which it was delivered, was remarkably temperate. While sanctioning by inference the memorable act of the day before, Owen honestly reminded his hearers that "much of the evil which had come upon the country had originated within their own walls," and earnestly warned them against "oppression, self-seeking, and contrivances for persecution." His eloquence as a preacher, as well as his fame as a theologian, brought him into favour with Cromwell and the parliament. On the 7th of June, 1649, the house by formal vote recommended the Oxford visitors to prefer him and a few others "to be heads of colleges;" and as the visitors did not

¹ Orme, 'Memoir of Owen' (1820), p. 133. The ensuing brief account of Owen is substantially derived from Orme's 'Memoir,' a work of considerable research, though somewhat biassed.

heed this instruction, the house itself, in March, 1650-1, "taking into consideration the worth and usefulness of Mr. John Owen, ordered that he be settled in the deanery of Christ Church, in the room of Dr. Reynolds." Two months before that Cromwell had succeeded the Earl of Pembroke as chancellor of the university, and eighteen months later, in September, 1652, on Cromwell's nomination, Owen was appointed to the then vacant post of vice-chancellor. He was thus virtual master of the whole university, as well as governor of Christ Church, when Locke began his studies at Oxford.

It was mainly through Owen's energy and that of his associates that any studies were possible at this time. During some years, till about the date of Locke's joining the university, academical pursuits of every sort had been nearly abandoned by all but a few strait-laced scholars. Hunting, gambling, and debauchery were the pursuits of Charles the First's picked body of graduates and undergraduates, and even after the worst of these had been weeded out the residue was bad enough. For two or three years the most zealous efforts of the puritan reformers seemed to be futile. In 1650 the visitors found it necessary, not for the first or last time, to bid the members of the university abstain from dressing and disporting themselves like cavaliers and French actors. "Some governors and many preachers, who ought to have been examples as to their garb and dress," says one who would be as lenient as he could to the offenders, "went more like persons of the inns of court or playhouses than such that were to deliver the oracles of God. Instead of short hair and collar-band with cassock, in a pulpit you might have beheld long powdered hair, large bands, half-shirts hanging out at their sleeves, and they them-

selves affecting nothing more ridiculous than starched formality or a prelatical cut.”¹

Whether starched formality and a prelatical cut would have been better than these unseemly costumes, without any amendment in the character and life of the men who wore them, may be doubtful. The academical debauchees had, at any rate, the merit of not being hypocrites. They made no pretence of virtue.

But that did not render their sins less hateful to the reformers. Dr. Owen, in his inaugural address as vice-chancellor, had good reason to complain of the state of things which he had to remedy. “It is not only the character of the age that distracts us,” he said, “but another calamity to our literary establishment, which is daily becoming more conspicuous—the contempt, namely, of the sacred character of the law, and of the reverence due to our ancestors, the watchful envy of malignants, the despised tears and sobs of our almost dying mother the university, and the detestable audacity and licentiousness, manifestly epicurean, beyond all the bounds

¹ Wood, ‘History and Antiquities of Oxford,’ vol. ii., p. 635. As it is still common (see even Prof. Burrows’s very interesting volume, ‘Worthies of All Souls’) to represent that the royalist members of the university were nearly as studious and virtuous as they were loyal, I may be excused for quoting this plain-speaking paragraph from Wood, vol. ii., p. 647. The date is 1651. “November 30th, Sunday, a conventicle of independents and other sectaries being kept at Bridewell-without-Northgate in the afternoon, to which, among persons of account, repaired divers handsome women, and among them the wife of Mr. Goodwyn, president of Magdalen College, the young scholars did repair thereunto more this day than ever before. Some of them encouraged, as ’tis said, by certain lay-people, not only put their hands under the women’s petticoats, but plucked off their shoes and garters, while others hummed, hissed, stamped, shoved, etc., and made such disturbance that some of the sectaries, drawing their swords, were encountered by the scholars with cudgels and other weapons.”

of modesty and piety, in which, alas, too many of the students indulge."¹ "For the first two years," he said in a later oration, "we were a mere rabble. Our critical situation and our common interests were discussed in journals and newspapers, by the most ignorant and despicable. Such was the pitch of madness, that to have stood up for gownsmen would have been reckoned a violation of religion and piety."² Matters reached such a pass, indeed, that advantage was taken of it, not only by a few extreme puritans who held that all learning save that to be attained by study of the Bible was damnable, but even by a man as different from them as Thomas Hobbes, to urge the suppression of the universities altogether; and with this object a "plot" was set on foot, happily in vain, in the Barebones Parliament.³

Owen and the more liberal puritans who worked with him found it no easy task to mend matters. That they did so, or at any rate that matters were mended under their rule, was admitted even by royalists. "It yielded," Clarendon wrote concerning the puritan rule, "a harvest of extraordinary good and sound knowledge in all parts of learning, and many who were wickedly introduced applied themselves to the study of good learning and the practice of virtue: so that when it pleased God to bring King Charles the Second back to his throne, he found that university abounding in excellent learning, devoted to duty and obedience, and little inferior to what it was before its desolation."⁴ There were many, even royalists, who

¹ Orme, p. 170.

² *Ibid.*, p. 172.

³ Godwin, 'History of the Commonwealth' (1828), vol. iv., p. 94; Wood, 'History and Antiquities of Oxford,' vol. iii., p. 657.

⁴ 'History of the Rebellion' (1849), vol. iv., p. 283.

thought that the condition of the university at the era of the Restoration, instead of being a little inferior, was a great deal superior to its condition while Charles the First was reigning.

The reformers, as the royalist historian admitted, set themselves to improve both the study of learning and the practice of virtue. As regards the former, however, they attempted to do little more than revive the academical, apart from the ecclesiastical, appointments of Archbishop Laud, while as regards the latter they were really innovators.

Before Owen assumed authority at Oxford the students had of course been relieved from the ordinary oaths and declarations of obedience to the rules of the episcopal church, and from compulsory performance of the slight religious services previously appointed for them, and some efforts had been made to insist on conformity to the religious opinions then in the ascendant; but these efforts were never very harshly made, and, in Owen's time at any rate, there was considerable toleration. The chief sign of the puritan supremacy in the university was in the unprecedented zeal with which the moral and religious well-being of its members was looked after.

In 1651, for instance, arrangements were made by the visitors for dispensing with the secular duties assigned to Saturday afternoon, and the substitution for them of a sermon to be preached at four o'clock in the chapel of Magdalen, to be followed by exercises preparatory to the solemn services of the morrow. The visitors also appointed that there should be a sermon every Sunday morning at eight o'clock at Corpus Christi, and one at four o'clock at St. Mary Magdalen, besides the usual noontide sermons in the various churches and chapels;

that there should be a seven o'clock morning sermon at St. Mary's every Tuesday, a four o'clock afternoon sermon at Christ Church every Thursday, and a seven o'clock morning sermon at All Hallows every Friday, besides an afternoon presbyterian meeting at Dr. Rogers's house on the same day, and Dr. Goodwin's independent meeting every Wednesday. Not content with all these religious opportunities, the visitors, in November, 1653, "upon consideration that one main use of the university is to train up young men in divine as well as human learning, and that exercise in the things of God doth much increase knowledge and favour therein," directed that there should be frequent additional preaching in every college, and regular services every Sunday morning, between seven and nine o'clock.¹

Shortly before that appointment of more preaching, on the 27th of June, 1653, the visitors had called for a return of all the tutors in the several colleges, and of all the undergraduates committed to their charge, and directed that all tutors who were not devout puritans should be dismissed, and further, that every undergraduate should be provided with some suitable tutor. On the same day they ordered that all bachelors of arts and undergraduates should, on every Sunday evening, between six and nine o'clock, "give an account, to some person of known ability and piety, to be appointed by the heads of houses, of the sermons they had heard, and their attendance on other religious exercises that day." And on the 4th of July following they decreed that all students under the

¹ Wood, 'History and Antiquities of Oxford,' vol. ii., pp. 645, 656. For accounts of these and other religious exercises, see Calamy's 'Continuation of Mr. Baxter's History of his Life and Times' (1718), and the 'Account of the Life and Death of Philip Henry' (1712).

care of tutors should repair to those tutors' chambers every evening, for so long as they were required, "to hear private prayers, and give an account of their time spent that day."¹

Those regulations were certainly tolerably strict; but they do not seem to have pressed very hardly on the less devout students, while to zealous puritans they afforded great satisfaction. All that Dr. Owen and the visitors appear to have insisted upon was that each student, besides devoting nearly the whole of Sunday to occupations considered suitable to the day, should hear at least one sermon on a week-day, and take part in so much evening worship and catechising as his tutor required. Much depended upon the religious temperament of the tutor, more upon the inclination of the student. If some students seized all the additional opportunities open to them, others probably found very irksome so much as was compulsory; but there could not have been much real hardship to any in the rules of the puritan masters of Oxford, and for those rules there is good excuse, if not ample justification, in the strong religious sentiment that prompted them. Finding that vice and indolence had taken possession of the university, the puritans sought to correct the latter by enforcing old and neglected academic appointments, and were yet more earnest in their endeavours to purge out the former by the introduction of, for Oxford, altogether novel "means of grace." In both ways they to a great extent succeeded, and in their success is their apology.

In religious matters there was a good deal of toleration. Those members of the university who were faithful to the episcopal church were not, of course, allowed publicly

¹ Wood, 'History and Antiquities of Oxford,' vol. ii., pp. 653, 654.

to follow their favourite modes of worship, or to proclaim their prohibited theological opinions; but they held their opinions in private, and a half-private use of their ritual was winked at.

In political matters, Dr. Owen and his assistants were more strict. No sign of opposition to Cromwell and the protectorate was allowed, and, however strong may have been the secret allegiance of many to their exiled king, it was altogether secret. The clandestine royalists were as loud as the puritans in their professions of agreement with the new order of things, and of admiration for the men who had instituted it.

When Locke took his bachelor's degree, in February, 1655-6, England seemed to have settled down to a millennium of republicanism; and Oxford, full as it was of the revered relics of ecclesiasticism and royalty, appeared to be more contented and prosperous under the revolution than it had been for many previous years. Mainly through Owen's energy and shrewdness, the university had been brought from a state of chaos into comparative quiet and good order; both political and religious differences had been repressed, though by no means extinguished, and the colleges were fairly devoted to the educational purposes for which they existed.

That the parliamentary visitors should have set themselves to check the social disorders that prevailed at Oxford when the Commonwealth was established, and to bring the university into agreement with their own religious convictions, is not so strange as that they should have undertaken to revive the most rigid academic discipline that had ever been prescribed for it. This, however, they not only attempted, but in great measure effected.

Early evidence of their zeal appears in an order issued by them in 1649, requiring the several heads and governors of colleges and halls "to cause either the Greek or Latin to be strictly and constantly exercised and spoken in their familiar discourse within the said several colleges and halls respectively, and that no other language be spoken by any fellow-scholar or student whatsoever;" the reason given for this severe injunction being "the complaint made by divers learned men of the defect that English scholars labour under, both in their primal and house exercises and in their public discourses with foreigners, by their speaking English in their several colleges and halls." This order was repeated in January, 1649-50, again in the following July, and apparently on subsequent occasions.¹

It is easier to make rules than to get them obeyed, easier sometimes to appoint good teachers than to find diligent pupils. During the Commonwealth period, however, not only were strict rules made and a number of able teachers appointed, but a great change was effected in the temper and occupations of the young men who went to the university as students. The contemporary annalist's account of one Christ Church man, Henry Stubbe, who was Locke's schoolfellow at Westminster, as well as now his college companion, is very significant. "While he continued undergraduate," we are told, "it was usual for him to discourse in the public schools very fluently in the Greek tongue. But since the king's restoration we have had no such matter; which shows that education and discipline were more severe then than

¹ *Queen's College MSS.*, cited in the appendix to the Fourth Report of the Historical Manuscripts Commission (1874), p. 456.

after, when scholars were given more to liberty and frivolous studies.”¹

The education and discipline that secured the talking, by Englishmen, of Greek and Latin instead of English, were not of the most enlightened sort; but they were better than nothing, and they were of great value according to the standards of those times. Whatever praise is due for such an achievement must be awarded to the puritan rulers of Oxford for cultivating everything then regarded as scholarship far more zealously than it had been during a long time previous or than it came to be during a long time subsequent to the crisis that they brought about. For the first time in the history of the university, they insisted that the gentlemen-commoners should be subjected to the same discipline, educational and social, as was prescribed for the other members of the various colleges and halls—that is, they refused to allow young men of wealth to spend a few years at Oxford in making a pretence of study, but really in using it as a haunt of dissipation, and in thereby exerting a bad influence on the youths who went thither with serious purpose.²

There was need for the puritan reformation. Under the early Stuarts, academical pursuits had greatly deteriorated. Oxford had not been so famous as Cambridge in the days of Elizabeth, but it had greatly improved upon the mediæval method of teaching, by allowing the study of classical literature to encroach upon, though not to displace, the barren scholasticism that had long starved the minds of its students, while professing to nourish them

¹ Wood, ‘*Athenæ Oxonienses*,’ vol. iii., col. 1068.

² *Queen’s College MSS.*, cited in the Historical Manuscripts Commissioners’ Fourth Report, appendix, p. 456.

with all the fruits of philosophy and science. Erasmus had given to it, as well as to the sister university, the beneficial influence of his presence, and it had raised up for itself teachers as eminent, in their own rather narrow way, as Linacre and Grocyn. In the next generation it could not boast of such men as Ascham, Smith, and Clarke, of Cambridge, but it prospered for a time, until both scholasticism and classicism went out of fashion under the rival yet combined influences of men who followed the lead of a courtier like "Steenie" Buckingham, and a prelate like Laud. A typical Oxford man of the first half of the seventeenth century was Bryan Dupper, who was successively dean of Christ Church and vice-chancellor of the university before taking high ecclesiastical office, and concerning whom this was the greatest panegyric that could be uttered by his greatest panegyrist:—"He was a man of excellent parts, and every way qualified for his function, especially as to the comeliness of his person and gracefulness of his deportment, which rendered him worthy the service of a court, and every way fit to stand before princes."¹

It may seem unfair to blame Archbishop Laud for helping to bring the university to the verge of ruin, and at the same time to commend the puritans for, for the first time, successfully enforcing the academical system that he set up. But, unfortunately, Laud's ecclesiastical bigotry far overtopped his academical zeal, and, while proposing to make Oxford a good school for all the learning that was then in vogue, he laboured so much more heartily to make it a seminary for abject slaves to divine-right archbishops and divine-right kings that his commendable intentions were altogether frustrated. The

¹ Wood, 'Athenæ Oxonienses,' vol. iii., col. 542.

clever workman who makes a good tool and puts it to a bad use does not deserve much praise: the praise is due to the person who employs it in a lawful way.

Perhaps, indeed, some special credit is due to the puritans for consenting to adopt the academical schemes of a man whom, as an ecclesiastic and a politician, they so bitterly hated. Looked at from a modern standpoint—and Locke's was a modern standpoint—the Laudian statutes which the puritans revived cannot be highly commended. But they had not the wit to devise anything better, and, lacking that wit, they honestly set aside all prejudices and did their utmost to work out successfully the best academical system that they found ready at their hands. Religion and morals they thought they understood better than any one else since the days of the apostles, and on these points they took no hints from Laud or any other enemy of Christ; but of the scholarship of this world they did not profess to have any superior understanding, and accordingly they resolutely enforced what they considered to be the most suitable scheme of secular education for Oxford and its thirty-two hundred members of all grades.¹

In one respect they must be especially commended. Assigning the theological and kindred professorships, as might be expected, to the best men they could find of their own ways of thinking, they chose most of their other teachers without any sort of bias. In one notable case, that of Dr. Edward Pocke, they even dispensed with the customary declaration of allegiance to Cromwell and the Long Parliament, because, though he was too staunch a royalist to sign that declaration, they did not

¹ In 1622 there were 2850 members of the university; in 1651 the number was 3247.—'Foundation of the University of Oxford' (1651), p. 17.

choose, by dismissing him, to forfeit the services of the best oriental scholar then living in England. In employing some scientific teachers who hardly made any secret of their heresy on church and state matters, moreover, they made Oxford for some time the head-quarters of scientific research. Archbishop Laud and his friends would never have shown such liberality.

Locke was twenty years old when he took up his residence at Oxford. He entered the university almost immediately after Dr. Owen had been appointed its vice-chancellor, as well as dean of Christ Church, and just at the time when the puritan reformation was fairly beginning. He entered it as a student of the richest, most influential, and most hard-working of all its colleges.

Under the puritans the functions of a tutor were more various and responsible than in the times before and after, or, at any rate, they were more rigidly performed. The tutor found for Locke was Thomas Cole, his senior by only five or six years, and like him a Westminster scholar who had obtained a Christ Church studentship. A churchman by early training, he became an independent at Oxford, and rose to be principal of St. Mary's Hall. He was ejected for his non-conformity in 1660, and thereupon established a school for the sons of independents at Nettlebed, in Oxfordshire, ultimately settling in London, and winning credit as a preacher. He appears to have been an amiable and tolerant man, and an excellent scholar. Even churchmen spoke of him as "a man of good learning, and of a gentle spirit."¹ There is no evi-

¹ 'Alumni Westmonasterienses,' p. 126; Wood, 'Fasti Oxonienses,' part ii., cols. 120, 166.

dence, however, that there was any closer intimacy between him and Locke than their relations required, or that, as a tutor, he did more than see that his pupil duly complied with the college and university routine from day to day.¹

As at Westminster, Locke would have to rise betimes in order to attend service in the college chapel every morning at five o'clock, where, of course, the ritual of the episcopal church was displaced by forms of worship in accordance with the rule of the Westminster Assembly. Unless now and then a morning sermon intervened, breakfast followed the early service, and between breakfast-time and the mid-day dinner the hours were chiefly occupied with attendance at the lectures of the university professors or the college readers, and with preparation for these lectures under Master Cole's guidance. At dinner-time, if he talked at all, Locke was required to talk in Latin. After dinner he had generally to attend a second public lecture, and, that being over, he was free, and was probably encouraged, to be present at the university disputations and declamations, except on Thursdays, which were appropriated to the Christ Church four-o'clock sermon, and on Saturdays, when he was expected to make preparation for the Sunday Sabbath. We know, on the information of his friend James Tyrrell, that he spent no more time than he could help at the disputations and declama-

¹ On the 10th of May, 1654, apparently as a tutorial fee, the elder Locke transmitted to "Mr. Cole for Mr. Locke, at Oxford," 8*l.* He also sent, perhaps in payment for clothes or books, 5*l.* to "Mr. Denny, for Mr. Locke, at Oxford," on the 13th of April, in the same year; and another 5*l.* to "Mr. Davis, for Mr. Locke, at Oxford," on the following 16th of June. These notes, and others that will be given hereafter, are from some stray accounts preserved by Locke.—*Shaftesbury Papers*, series viii., no. 3.

tions, "for Mr. Locke never loved the trade of disputing in public in the schools, but was always wont to declaim against it as being invented for wrangling or ostentation, rather than to discover truth."¹ And we may reasonably assume that he did not, like many of his puritan fellow-students, run about from chapel to chapel, and from church to church, with a quenchless appetite for coloured and very much diluted draughts of the teaching of him who is reported to have said, "Whosoever drinketh of the water that I shall give him shall never thirst." It was necessary for him, however, to be present at the evening service in his college chapel, and after that to attend at his tutor's chambers, for so long as he was required, to hear prayers and to give an account of his day's occupations. The rest of his time, which was not much, before early going to bed, he was free to spend as he chose, except that he might on no account go into the town without leave of his tutor, and never, with or without leave, show himself in any ale-house or other wicked haunt.²

About the college lectures at which he had to be present we have not much information. During his first and second years at Oxford there were four a week. In the first year he had to attend morning lectures every Monday and Thursday on rhetoric, and every Tuesday and Friday on grammar. In the second year he had to attend lectures, every Monday and Thursday, by the

¹ MSS. in the *Remonstrants' Library*; Lady Masham to Jean le Clerc, 12th January, 1704-5, quoting Tyrrell's words.

² The above details, as well as many of those that follow, are drawn partly from the various puritan orders already referred to, partly from the Laudian statutes, of which a careful translation is given in Ward's 'Oxford University Statutes,' vol. i. (1845).

college reader in logic, and every Tuesday and Friday, by the university professor of moral philosophy. During this early period he was expected to pay a good deal of attention to studies which, being too elementary for the public lecturers to concern themselves with, were left to his tutor. In his third year he had to attend public lectures every Monday and Thursday morning on logic, every Tuesday and Friday morning on moral philosophy, and every Wednesday and Saturday on geometry in the morning, and on Greek in the afternoon. In the fourth year the same round of eight lectures on the same subjects had to be gone through, with the addition of some compulsory attendance at the public disputations. That, as far as it can be made out, is the time-table of Locke's class-work until the 14th of February, 1655-6, when he obtained the degree of bachelor of arts.¹

Who were his instructors in grammar and rhetoric during his first year, and in logic in the following three years, is not recorded; but this is not a matter of much importance. Whoever the teachers, the teaching was doubtless about the same. In grammar, according to Priscian and Linacre, he probably had very little to learn, having mastered it all *ad nauseam* at Westminster. And if the rhetoric and logic now imparted to him were not altogether stale, there was not much profit in them. The logic was the Aristotelian logic, which had been filtered—perhaps we should say vitiated—through the minds of some thousands of Greek, Roman, dark-age and mediæval commentators, and the most important reformation in which, such as it was, had been effected by Ramus and his numerous disciples in England, Scotland, and elsewhere. At Oxford, in Locke's day, the

¹ Wood, 'Fasti Oxonienses,' part ii., col. 187.

Ramists and anti-Ramists fought out their interminable battle, or their battle terminable only by the utter annihilation of both parties; and as Ramus had been a Huguenot, and as opinions somewhat akin to those of the Huguenots were in the ascendant just then, it is probable that Ramism was chiefly favoured. This, however, was no gain. Bacon, not very long before, had complained that, in the hands of Aristotle's interpreters, "the gravest of sciences" had come to consist of little more than "childish sophistry and ridiculous affectation," and, poorly as he thought of Aristotelian logic, he had condemned yet more vehemently the Ramist modification of it. Bacon, it is true, had in 1623 been complimented by the university of Oxford as "a mighty Hercules who had by his own hand greatly advanced those pillars in the learned world which by the rest of the world were supposed immovable;"¹ but the modern Hercules was not able to remove the pseud-Aristotelian pillars at Oxford.

What Locke thought of the logical and kindred teaching provided for him may be read in his own words. "I have seldom or never," he wrote, "observed any one to get the skill of reasoning well or speaking handsomely by studying those rules which pretend to teach it. Right reasoning is founded on something else than the predicaments and predicables, and does not consist in talking in mode and figure itself. If the use and end of right reasoning be to have right notions and a right judgment of things, to distinguish betwixt truth and falsehood, right and wrong, and to act accordingly, be sure not to let your son be bred up in the art and formality of disputing, either practising it himself or admiring it in others, unless, instead of an able man, you desire to have

¹ Blakey, 'Historical Sketch of Logic' (1851), p. 422.

him an insignificant wrangler, opinionator in discourse, and priding himself in contradicting others, or—which is worse—questioning everything, and thinking there is no such thing as truth to be sought, but only victory in disputing. There cannot be anything so disingenuous, so misbecoming a gentleman or any one who pretends to be a rational creature, as not to yield to plain reason and the conviction of clear arguments. Is there anything more inconsistent with civil conversation, and the end of all debate, than not to take an answer, though never so full and satisfactory, but still to go on with the dispute as long as equivocal sounds can furnish a *medius terminus*, a term to wrangle with on the one side or a distinction on the other, whether pertinent or impertinent, sense or nonsense, agreeing with or contrary to what he had said before, it matters not? For this, in short, is the way and perfection of logical disputes, that the opponent never take any answer nor the respondent never yield to any argument. This neither of them must do, whatever becomes of truth or knowledge, unless he will pass for a poor baffled wretch, and lie under the disgrace of not being able to maintain whatever he has once affirmed, which is the great aim and glory of disputing.”¹

In the first year of his moral philosophy studies, Locke had to attend the lectures of Dr. Henry Wilkinson, junior, an eminent presbyterian; and in the following two years, those of Mr. Francis Howell, an eminent independent, who succeeded to the professorship in 1654. Both men had the reputation of good learning and, quite as important a quality in dealers with such a subject, of considerable liberality in their religious opinions. But there was not room for much liberality or diversity of treatment in

¹ ‘Some Thoughts concerning Education,’ §§ 188, 189.

anything but word-splitting in the verbal exposition of Aristotle's 'Nicomachean Ethics,' 'Politics,' and 'Economics,' which were the subjects assigned to the lecturers. The ground here chosen was, it is true, in one sense broad enough, but it was terribly barren—a kind of intellectual desert of Sahara, in which, by long perversion of their thinking faculties, successive generations of schoolmen had contrived to obtain a certain sort of nourishment from eating its sands and a certain sort of refreshment from inhaling its parching blasts, had enjoyed the painful task of each day treading out, with knee-deep marks, paths that each morrow's storm entirely obliterated, and had derived amusement from the perpetual hunting of mirages in which there was never any reality.

Locke inherited none of those strange tendencies and capacities. "I have often heard him say, in reference to his first years spent in the university," said his friend Lady Masham, "that he had so small satisfaction there from his studies, as finding very little light brought thereby to his understanding, that he became discontented with his manner of life, and wished his father had rather designed him for anything else than what he was destined to, apprehending that his no greater progress in knowledge proceeded from his not being fitted or capacitated to be a scholar."¹ "I myself," said another friend, Jean le Clerc, "heard him complain of his early studies, in a conversation I one day had with him on the subject; and when I told him that I had a tutor who was a disciple of Descartes and was a man of very clear intelligence, he said that he had not that good fortune (though it is well

¹ MSS. in the Remonstrants' Library; Lady Masham to Le Clerc, 12th Jan., 1704-5.

known he was not a Cartesian), and that he lost a great deal of time at the commencement of his studies, because the only philosophy then known at Oxford was the peripatetic, perplexed with obscure terms and useless questions.”¹

He must have found some relief when, in his third year, he was allowed to study geometry under such a teacher as Dr. John Wallis, the Savilian professor from 1649 till 1703. A man of exemplary life, broad sympathies and comprehensive genius, Wallis exerted upon the young men at Oxford, and upon Locke among the number, a wider and deeper influence than grew merely out of his university lectures, although the subjects of those lectures were more deep and wide than might be supposed from the modern application of the word geometry. Besides expounding Euclid, Appolonius and Archimedes, he had to teach arithmetic, mechanics, practical geometry, and the principles of music, and, if he chose, he might lecture on what were then the intricacies of plane and spherical trigonometry. His Wednesday and Saturday lectures being in Latin, he was also required to hold a weekly class at his own lodgings, though attendance at it was optional, for teaching “practical logic or arithmetic of all kinds, which is best communicated without any formality”—a strange admission for the old statute to make, while it is almost stranger to find that he was allowed to conduct this class “in the vulgar tongue, if he think fit.”²

Though Locke never paid very much attention to the mathematical sciences, he probably attended Dr. Wallis’s English class in arithmetic as a step towards logic, and

¹ Le Clerc, ‘Eloge de M. Locke,’ in his ‘Bibliothèque Choisie,’ tom. vi. (1705), p. 347.

² Ward, ‘Oxford University Statutes,’ vol. i., p. 274.

from him perhaps he derived his very sensible opinion that "arithmetic is the easiest and consequently the first sort of abstract reasoning which the mind commonly bears or accustoms itself to."¹

From the lectures on Greek delivered by Dr. John Harmor, who had been under-master at Westminster before he was made regius professor at Oxford, and who is described as "a most excellent philologist and a tolerable Latin poet, happy in rendering Greek into Latin, or Latin into English, or English into Greek or Latin, whether in prose or verse"²—Locke probably had not much more to learn. His Westminster training must have brought him quite up to the level requisite for his degree, and, though he was evidently a fair Greek scholar, there is nothing to show that he entered into any rivalry with Stubbe and the few others of his day who affected the severer classical studies. "No man," he said at a later day, "can pass for a scholar, that is ignorant of the Greek tongue;" but he only approved of its being studied because "amongst the Grecians is to be found the original, as it were, and foundation of all that learning which we have in this part of the world;"³ and he never had any liking at all for those minute grammatical exercises in which some of his contemporaries indulged. Latin and Greek verse-writing, for the mere pedantic exhibition of familiarity with the husks and dry bones of classical literature, he regarded as very nearly, if not quite, as wasteful of good time, and as destructive of

¹ 'Some Thoughts concerning Education,' § 180.

² Wood, 'Athenæ Oxonienses,' vol. iii., col. 918. Most of the gossip about the Oxford teachers given in these paragraphs, where no other authority is specified, is derived from Wood.

³ 'Some Thoughts concerning Education,' § 195.

sound intellectual energy, as Greek and Latin declamations in fantastic support of Aristotelian and pseud-Aristotelian dogmas.

This being so, it is somewhat curious to note that Locke's first published composition was a small piece of Latin verse. There was a reason for this, however. The defeat of the Dutch in 1653, and the beneficial treaty of peace signed by Cromwell in April, 1654, having proved that England could maintain her naval reputation as well during the Commonwealth as under any Stuart king, Cromwell's admirers and partisans used the opportunity thus afforded for singing loud his praises. Among the rest, Dr. Owen procured from the members of the university, and especially from the students of Christ Church, a string of complimentary poems, considerably over a hundred in number, and written by more than a hundred different hands. These appeared in a volume entitled, 'Musarum Oxoniensium *Ἐλαιοφορία*,' with a prose preface and some introductory verses by Owen himself. Among the contributors were both old and young members of the university, professors and scholars, honest puritans and clandestine royalists, Zouch and Bathurst, Busby and his pupil South, Philip Henry, and several other Westminster students at Christ Church. Locke contributed two pieces. The first was in Latin:—

“ Pax regit Augusti quem vicit Julius orbem :
 Ille sago factus clarior, ille toga.
 Hos sua Roma vocat magnos et numina credit,
 Hic quod fit mundi victor, et ille quies.
 Tu bellum ut pacem populis das, unus utrisque ;
 Major es: ipse orbem vincis, et ipse regis
 Non hominem e coelo missum te credimus: unus
 Sic poteras binos qui superare Deos ! ”¹

¹ 'Musarum Oxoniensium *Ἐλαιοφορία*' (1654), p. 45.

The second was in English :—

“ If Greece with so much mirth did entertain
Her *Argo*, coming laden home again,
With what loud mirth and triumph shall we greet
The wish'd approaches of our welcome fleet,
When of that prize our ships do us possess
Whereof their fleece was but an emblem—Peace,
Whose welcome voice sounds sweeter in our ears
Than the loud music of the warbling spheres,
And, ravishing more than those, doth plainly show
That sweetest harmony we to discord owe ?
Each seaman's voice, pronouncing peace, doth charm,
And seems a siren's, but that 't has less harm
And danger in't, and yet like theirs doth please
Above all other, and make us love the seas.
We've heaven in this peace : like souls above,
We've nought to do now but admire and love.

Glory of war is victory. But here
Both glorious be, 'cause neither 's conqueror.
'T had been less honour, if it might be said
They fought with those that could be conquer'd.

Our re-united seas, like streams that flow
Into one river, do the smoother flow
Where ships no longer grapple, but, like those,
The loving seamen in embraces close.
We need no fire-ships now : a nobler flame
Of love doth us protect, whereby our name
Shall shine more glorious, a flame as pure
As those of heaven, and shall as long endure.
This shall direct our ships, and he that steers
Shall not consult heaven's fires, but those he bears
In his own breast. Let Lilly threaten wars,
Whilst this conjunction lasts, we'll fear no stars.

Our ships are now most beneficial grown,
Since they bring home no spoils but what's their own.
Unto these branchless pines our forward spring
Owes better fruit than autumn 's wont to bring ;

Which gives not only gems and Indian ore,
 But adds at once whole nations to the store :
 Nay, if to make a world 's but to compose
 The difference of things, and make them close
 In mutual amity, and cause peace to creep
 Out of the jarring chaos of the deep,
 Our ships do this ; so that, whilst others' take
 Their course about the world, ours a world make."¹

If those exercises do not show great poetical ability, they are quite equal in merit to some contributions to the same volume by men more noted in their day as verse-writers ; and, which is more important, they offer far less extravagant praise of Cromwell than was here uttered by men who had less sympathy with the protector and republicanism than we must attribute to John Locke.

In taking his bachelor's degree on the 14th of February, 1655-6, Locke abridged the old quadrennium, as was often done, by one term. In proceeding to the degree of master of arts, on the 29th of June, 1658,² he adopted the less usual course of shortening his triennium by two terms. He thus completed his curriculum twelve months before the expiration of the seven years that were covered by the junior studentship conferred upon him as a Westminster scholar.

At the close of that septennium his connection with Christ Church would come to an end, unless, as was the case with nearly every competent man from Westminster, he was elected to a senior studentship, which at Christ Church was equivalent to a fellowship at another college. That he was so elected is clear, and, though no record of

¹ 'Musarum Oxoniensium *Ἐλαιοψορῆα*' (1654), pp. 94, 95.

² Wood, 'Fasti Oxonienses,' part ii., col. 214.

the fact appears, we may safely assume that his election took place either in 1658 or early in 1659. These senior studentships, unless taken away for bad behaviour, or for some other special reason, were tenable for life, and we know that Locke held one of them till 1684.

The public lectures that he was obliged to attend as a graduate were more numerous than those prescribed for undergraduates, and they, of course, suggested the line of study in which the students might profitably spend all their working hours. But very little knowledge in addition to that required at the bachelor's examination, very little more than mere attendance at lectures and disputations, was exacted from applicants for the mastership; and thus, especially as connection with a tutor was no longer necessary, the graduates were free to spend nearly as much or as little time as they chose in study, and also to make pretty much their own choice of studies.

We have already heard, from Lady Masham, that Locke had avowed to her his discouragement at the result of all the unprofitable reading in which he was expected to engage. "This discouragement, he said," the same informant adds, "kept him from being any very hard student, and put him upon seeking the company of pleasant and witty men, with whom he likewise took great delight in corresponding by letters; and in conversation and these correspondences he, according to his own account of himself, spent for some years much of his time."¹

¹ MSS. in the Remonstrants' Library; Lady Masham to Le Clerc, 12 Jan., 1704-5. "It is scarce to be thought," Lady Masham goes on to say, "that he writ so well then as after he had lived more in the world, and been advantaged by the politer conversation of great men. Else it would be a pity that those letters should be lost; for I doubt whether Voiture excelled him in that part of writing afterwards, when he had other employment than

That statement is valuable, as confirming the inference, which might reasonably have been made without it, that Locke found more satisfaction in the society of intelligent young men of the world, than in that of beardless pedants. We are also told, on less indisputable authority, that "Mr. Locke spent a good part of his first years at the university in reading romances, from his aversion to the disputations then in fashion there."¹

We must not, however, suppose that he idled away much of his time at Oxford, and paid no attention to the sterner work of the university. Though he wisely availed himself of all the relaxation and all the good influences within his reach, it is certain that he honestly conformed to the rules of work which were morally, if not legally, enforced upon him by acceptance of his Christ Church studentship.

What then were the university studies prescribed for him? He had to supplement his reading in Aristotelian logic and Aristotelian moral philosophy with reading in Aristotelian metaphysics and Aristotelian natural philosophy. He had to make some study of history. From the subjects then included in the term geometry, he had to advance to the subjects then included in the term astronomy. And to the continued study of Greek he had to add Hebrew and Arabic. He had thus to attend at least one morning and one afternoon lecture every weekday, besides occasional classes for the more practical study of the mathematical sciences and the oriental languages. He was also obliged to be respondent or opponent at least once a year at the Augustine disputa-

to make this any business." For all that, "it is a pity that those letters should be lost."

¹ Spence, 'Anecdotes' (ed. Singer), p. 107.

tions, and to engage in some other Aristotelian word-fighting.¹

His Aristotelian metaphysics Locke had to derive from one of the college lecturers, there being no university professorship established for that subject. In natural philosophy, or Aristotelian physics, he was instructed by Joshua Crosse, the Sedleian professor, about whom very little is known. From neither lecturer, though it was their business to solve the whole mystery of things animate and inanimate, is it likely that he gained much, unless it was they who sent him to Descartes and ultimately to something better than Cartesianism.

The lectures on history were, by the Laudian statutes, limited to "Lucius Florus or any other historians of ancient date and repute;" and the Camden professor of history in Locke's day was Louis du Moulin, a Leyden physician, and, according to Anthony Wood, "a fiery, violent, and hot-headed independent." It would be interesting to know how the medical nonconformist discoursed on Greek and Roman myths; but the information is not extant, and perhaps the loss of it is not great as regards Locke's mental history.²

Continuing for a year longer to attend the lectures of Dr. John Wallis on geometry, Locke had also to obtain instruction in astronomy from Dr. Seth Ward. Here also he was fortunate. Ward, though not so eminent a mathematician, still less as liberal-minded a man, as Wallis, was a good and able teacher. He was almost the first professor of astronomy, we are told, who lectured on

¹ Ward, 'Oxford University Statutes.'

² Among the *Shaftesbury Papers* (series viii., no. 5) is a small notebook, apparently in Locke's handwriting, and looking like a college exercise, entitled, 'Collections out of the History of England,' containing a bare epitome of events, down to the latter part of the eleventh century.

astronomy. Before his time, no audience being obtained, the lectures had been for many years dispensed with; but he revived the class, and obtained in it a number of diligent pupils. Nor did he neglect the other subjects assigned to him. He lectured, not only on the ancient methods of astronomy, from Ptolemy downwards, and on the improvements of Copernicus, Galileo, and other moderns, but also on optics and gnomonics, on the application of mathematics to geography and navigation, and on other adaptations of mathematical science.

Neither in that science nor in its adaptations did Locke take much interest, but he made as much acquaintance with them as was necessary to the good education of a gentleman, and one in life-long communication with scientific men of all sorts. In the age of Newton it was fortunate that its other master-mind ran in a different groove; and we certainly need not regret that Locke's temperament did not lead him to derive all the special advantage that was possible to one who was a pupil of John Wallis and Seth Ward.

Besides these mathematical teachers there was one other learned professor to whose lectures it is likely that Locke paid no more attention than was prescribed by the university rules. He probably knew something of Hebrew before he left Westminster, and at Oxford, having to attend Arabic as well as Hebrew classes twice a week during two or three years, he doubtless continued these studies to a moderate extent; but he certainly never won any fame as an oriental scholar.

Yet, of all his teachers at Oxford, the one whom he most revered, perhaps the only one whom he much revered, was Dr. Edward Pococke, the regius professor of Hebrew and the Laudian professor of Arabic.

This good man, after spending many years at Aleppo and other places in the East, where he made excellent use of the opportunities afforded him for studying oriental languages and institutions, was in 1636 selected by Laud as the first occupant of the Arabic chair that he had just founded at Oxford. The civil war, and his devotion to the royalist cause, hindered his lecturing during several years; but as soon as peace was established, the parliamentary authorities, as has already been mentioned, showed remarkable liberality in relieving him from the necessity of either taking the new oath of allegiance or resigning the Arabic chair. They even made him professor of Hebrew as well as of Arabic. From 1648 till his death in 1691, he was an enthusiastic worker in the learned province of literature to which he especially devoted himself; and we have Locke's testimony that his great scholarship was almost the least of his merits.

"So extraordinary an example, in so degenerate an age," Locke wrote, "deserves, for the rarity, and, I was going to say, for the incredibility of it, the attestation of all that knew him, and considered his worth. The Christian world is a witness of his great learning, that the works he published would not suffer to be concealed. But his other virtues and excellent qualities had so strong and close a covering of unaffected humility, that—though they shone the brighter to those who had the opportunity to be more intimately acquainted with him, and eyes to discern and distinguish solidity from show, and esteem virtue that sought not reputation—yet they were the less taken notice and talked of by the generality of those to whom he was not wholly unknown. Not that he was at all close and reserved; but, on the contrary, the readiest to communicate to any one that consulted him. Indeed, he was

not forward to talk, nor ever would be the leading man in the discourse, though it were on a subject that he understood better than any of the company, and would often content himself to sit still, and hear others debate in matters which he himself was more a master of. He had often the silence of a learner, where he had the knowledge of a master; and that not with a design, as is often, that the ignorance any one betrayed might give him the opportunity to display his own knowledge with the more lustre and advantage to their shame, or censure them when they were gone; for these arts of triumph and ostentation, frequently practised by men of skill and ability, were utterly unknown to him. It was very seldom he contradicted any one, or if it were necessary at any time to inform him better who was in a mistake, it was in so soft and gentle a manner that it had nothing of the air of dispute or correction, and seemed to have little of opposition in it. I never heard him say anything that put any one who was present the least out of countenance, nor ever censure, or so much as speak diminishingly, of any one that was absent." He seems to have been in simplicity and nobility of temperament very like his panegyrist. Perhaps Locke learnt something more and better than Hebrew and Arabic from him.

"He was a man," Locke continued, "of no irregular appetites. If he indulged any one too much, it was that of study, which his wife would often complain of (I think not without reason), that a due consideration of his age and health could not make him abate. Though he was a man of the greatest temperance in himself, and the farthest from ostentation and vanity in his way of living, yet he was of a liberal mind and given to hospitality, which, considering the smallness of his preferments and

the numerous family of children he had to provide for, might be thought to have outdone those who made more noise and show. I do not remember that in all my conversation with him I ever saw him once angry, or to be so provoked as to change colour or countenance or tone of voice. His life appeared to me one constant calm. I can say of him, what few men can say of any friend of theirs, nor I of any other of my acquaintance, that I do not remember I ever saw in him any one action that I did or could, in my own mind, blame or think amiss in him.”¹

It is worth noting that the man here praised so highly was the one prominent and most outspoken royalist and episcopalian in the university. This friendship must have done something to wean Locke from the puritanism that had been encouraged in him by his father.

His other university friends, men more nearly of his own age, appear to have been, though not all royalists, chosen quite as much from royalist as from puritan circles.

One of these friends was Nathaniel Hodges, who went to Christ Church from Westminster in the year in which Locke entered the school, but with whom he formed acquaintance at Oxford. Hodges took his degree as master of arts in 1657, and was proctor of the university in 1666, and afterwards professor of moral philosophy. He became chaplain to the first Earl of Shaftesbury, by whom, when he was lord chancellor and apparently through

¹ Leonard Twells, ‘Life of Dr. Edward Pockocke,’ prefixed to a collected edition of his ‘Theological Works’ (1740); Locke to Humphrey Smith, 23 July, 1703. This letter had been previously printed in ‘A Collection of Several Pieces of John Locke’ (1720), without the name of the person to whom it was addressed.

Locke's influence, he was in 1673 made prebend of Norwich and Gloucester. We have few particulars of their friendship, but it lasted long. "I hear, this post," Locke wrote in 1700, "that my old friend Mr. Hodges is dead. He, Dr. Thomas, and I were intimate friends in our younger days in the university. They two are gone, and who could have thought that I, much the weakest and most unlikely of the three, should have outlived them?"¹

With David Thomas, the other friend there mentioned by Locke, we shall often meet hereafter. He was probably a native of Salisbury, where he afterwards resided, and he must have been Locke's senior by some few years. He was educated at New College, but as to the exact period of his studies we have no record. As he was made a doctor of medicine in December, 1670,² he must have been a bachelor of arts not later than 1663, and a master of arts not later than 1666; and it is most likely that he took those degrees at considerably earlier dates. The first positive information that we have about him is in the bare record that in 1665 he was appointed proctor of the university.³ It shows, however, that at that time he had a good standing at Oxford.

Another of Locke's early companions was James Tyrrell, who, being ten years his junior, must be regarded as in some sort his pupil as well as his friend. Tyrrell was born in London in 1642, being the eldest son of Sir Timothy Tyrrell, of Shotover, whose wife was the daughter and heiress of Archbishop Ussher. In 1657, when only fifteen years old, he became a gentleman commoner

¹ *Additional MSS.* in the British Museum, No. 4290; Locke to Edward Clarke, 11 Nov., 1700.

² Wood, 'Fasti Oxonienses,' part ii., col. 320.

³ *Ibid.*, part ii., col. 280.

of Queen's College. In 1663 he took his master's degree, and in 1665 he was called to the bar at Lincoln's Inn.¹ He does not appear to have followed his profession. Living sometimes in London, sometimes at his house near Oxford, he occupied himself with philosophical and other studies, out of which grew his 'Patriarcha non Monarcha,' published in 1681, his 'Bibliotheca Politica' in 1691, his 'Brief Disquisition of the Laws of Nature' in 1692, and the 'History of England,' written in later years, for which he is chiefly remembered. His quick parts and amiable disposition soon made him a favourite with Locke, whose acquaintance with him began in 1658, and also with Thomas. Both of them were fond of designating him by the complimentary epithet of Musidore.² "Mr. Tyrrell tells me," wrote Lady Masham, "that Mr. Locke was then looked upon as one of the most learned and ingenious young men in the college he was of."³

We have already heard that Locke considered the time spent by him during some years in the study of philosophy to have been nearly wasted, "because the only philosophy then known at Oxford"—known, that must have been, in the lecture rooms and class-rooms—"was the peripatetic, perplexed with obscure terms and useless questions."⁴ "The first books, as Mr. Locke himself

¹ Wood, 'Athenæ Oxonienses,' vol iv., col. 520.

² "You send me no news of Musidore," Thomas wrote in a letter to Locke in November, 1669 (*Shaftesbury Papers*, series viii., No. 2).

³ MSS. in the Remonstrants' Library; Lady Masham to Jean le Clerc, 12 Jan., 1704-5.

⁴ Le Clerc, 'Eloge de M. Locke' in the 'Bibliothèque Choisie,' tom. vi., p. 347.

has told me," said Lady Masham, "which gave him a relish of philosophical things, were those of Descartes. He was rejoiced in reading these, because, though he very often differed in opinion from this writer, he yet found that what he said was very intelligible; from whence he was encouraged to think that his not having understood others had possibly not proceeded from a defect in his understanding."¹

Had Locke not yet made acquaintance with the writings of Bacon, which could hardly have been beyond the understanding of such a student? or did he regard Bacon rather as the great herald and pioneer of the new philosophy than as himself a great philosopher? There would be some warrant for that view, and though Locke's philosophical debt to Bacon was a great one, Descartes was evidently a more attractive teacher for one situated and constituted as Locke was. We can readily understand with what relief he turned from the Aristotelian and scholastic dogmas to learn from Descartes all that was good in his teaching, until he was competent to set about correcting and controverting all that seemed to him to be not good.

Widely different as were both their careers and the philosophical conclusions at which they arrived, there was a close resemblance between the early intellectual circumstances of Locke and those of Descartes. The French philosopher, after referring to the scholastic education provided for him by his Jesuit teachers, said, "As soon as I had completed all that course of study at the termination of which one is usually admitted into the ranks of the learned, I found myself embarrassed with so many doubts

¹ MSS. in the Remonstrants' Library; Lady Masham to Le Clerc, 12 Jan. 1704-5.

and errors, that, as it appeared to me, I had derived no other benefit from the pursuit of knowledge than this, that I had thoroughly discovered my own ignorance." "For this reason," he continued, "as soon as my age permitted me to escape from my teachers, I quitted entirely the study of letters, and, resolving to seek no other science than such as I could find in myself, or rather in the great book of the world, I employed the rest of my youth in travel, in seeing courts and armies, in mixing with people of different humours and conditions, in collecting diverse experiences, in testing myself in the situations in which fortune placed me, and in striving to draw profitable convictions from all that offered itself to me. For it seemed to me that I should find more truth in the reasonings of different men in their own affairs, and which, if wrong, would be quickly punished with failure, than in such reasonings as the philosopher makes in his study upon speculations that have no effect on himself, and are of no immediate consequence to him."¹

Locke, though setting quite as much value on the teaching of practical life, was satisfied with a somewhat narrower range of observation, and, besides having greater advantages in this way, was more willing to profit by the observation and teaching of other rebels from Aristotelianism; but he revolted quite as fearlessly, as we have seen, from the dogmas provided for him and forced upon him by his academical teachers.

Born in 1596, René Descartes had learnt before he was seventeen everything that his Jesuit masters at La Flèche could teach him, which was perhaps a good deal more than all the contemporary professors at Oxford could

¹ 'Discours de la Méthode,' part i.

have provided for their pupils. He had then gone out into that school of the world of which he thought so much; and at the age of twenty-three, he tells us, he began to plan the reformation of philosophy, the date, it should be noted, being about fifteen years after the appearance of Bacon's 'Advancement of Learning,' and apparently the same year in which the 'Novum Organum' was published. He continued his wanderings for ten years longer, however, and then spent eight years more in such complete privacy that even his most intimate friends did not know where to find him. It was in those eight years that *his* "great instauration" was projected and elaborated—an instauration that was to bring about quite as important a change in metaphysical studies as was the change due to Bacon's scheme for unfolding the secrets of the physical world. The 'Discours de la Méthode,' published in 1637, contained the germ of nearly all his philosophy, although that philosophy received considerable amplification in the 'Meditationes de Prima Philosophia,' which appeared in 1641, in the 'Principia Philosophiæ,' dated 1644, and in the later works that were printed before and after his death in 1650.

Bacon, unless we except Giordano Bruno, was the first great rebel against the time-honoured rule, observed by all the rival schoolmen, by which philosophy was kept in subjection to theology. He did not set philosophy in opposition to theology; he quietly left it alone. "If I proceed to speak of theology," he said, "I shall step out of the barque of human reason, and enter into the ship of the church, which cannot, without the divine compass, properly direct its course; and for which the stars of philosophy, which have hitherto shone on us so brilliantly,

afford no light. On this subject, therefore, it is well that I should keep silence.”¹

Descartes took a different view. Not satisfied with asserting the independence of philosophy, he proposed to make theology subject to it. “I have always thought,” he wrote, “that the two questions of the existence of God and the nature of the soul were the chief of those which ought to be demonstrated by philosophy rather than by theology; for although it is sufficient for believers to have faith in the existence of God and in the immortality of the soul, it is hardly possible to convert unbelievers to any religion, unless we first convince them of these two matters by natural reason.”² In urging this, Descartes probably did not mean to be jesuitical; he may have been as blind to the logical outcome of his proposed invasion of the domain of faith by reason as were the orthodox persons who readily accepted it; but the invasion being allowed, there was not so very great a difference between the position of Descartes and the position of Spinoza.

Spinoza, however, being three months younger than Locke, made no public utterance till long after the period at which we have arrived, and exerted no influence at all on Locke while he was at Oxford. And Locke, though he may possibly have been at first attracted by the Cartesian attempt to prop up theology with philosophy, had utterly rejected the suggestion before he began to be himself a teacher. He had also rejected much else in the Cartesian philosophy, and much that he was doubtless ready enough to accept on his first reading of the works of Descartes.

¹ ‘De Augmentis,’ lib. ix., cap. 1.

² ‘Meditationes,’ Dedication to the Deans and Doctors of the Sacred Faculty of Theology of Paris.

He, like Descartes, was weary of Aristotelianism and scholasticism. Descartes's "method" must have come to him like a revelation from heaven.

That method consisted in the repudiation of all external influences and artificial dogmas, and the building up of a complete new system of philosophy on the basis of consciousness. "Cogito, ergo sum," was Descartes's famous phrase. I am conscious of my own existence: that, if nothing else, is certain to me; and a like certainty must be with every other thinking individual. Consciousness is the foundation, the only foundation, of knowledge. Whatever consciousness clearly and distinctly proclaims must be true: in other words, every clear and distinct idea must be true; everything that can be clearly and distinctly conceived of as existing must exist.

The psychological system of Descartes was accordingly based by him on these four rules: "The first was, Never to accept anything as true but what is evidently so; carefully to avoid precipitancy and prejudice, and to admit nothing but what so clearly and distinctly presents itself as true that there can be no ground of doubt. The second, To divide every separate question into as many separate parts as may be necessary for its adequate solution. The third, To conduct the examination in such order as, beginning with objects the most simple, and therefore the easiest to be known, as it were step by step to ascend to knowledge of the most complex, assigning in thought a certain order even to those objects which in their own nature are not as antecedent and consequent. And lastly, To make such exact enumerations, and such general reviews, as to be confident that nothing essential has been omitted."¹

¹ 'Discours de la Méthode,' part ii.

How are our opinions and convictions to be tested? How are we to know that they are really clear and distinct, and therefore true? By deduction. "Those long chains of reasoning, all simple and easy, which geometers use to arrive at their most difficult demonstrations," said Descartes, "suggested to me that all things which come within human knowledge must follow each other in a similar chain; and that, provided we abstain from admitting anything as true which is not so and that we always preserve in them the order necessary to deduce one from the other, there can be none so remote to which we cannot finally attain, nor so obscure but that we may discover them."¹

Consciousness is the basis of certitude. Deduction is the method of certitude. Those were the two grand theses of Descartes. With their help, regarding his own existence as an unprovable but also an undeniable fact, he proceeded to demonstrate the existence of God, to establish the fundamental difference between soul and body, mind and matter, and then out of these materials to build up the whole universe. Few modern readers can help smiling at the dapper audacity with which he did this; but his exploit was only in logical sequence to the principles from which he started; and to students weary, as was Locke, of Aristotelian and scholastic mystifications, most of his teaching must have been very grateful.

The most important of his metaphysical discoveries, or revivals that were equal to discoveries, was his distinction between the primary and secondary qualities of matter.²

¹ 'Discours de la Méthode,' part ii.

² Illustrated in this extract from the 'Meditations': "Let us take a piece of wax from the honeycomb. It has some taste and smell; it is hard and

His most influential dogma was his theory of innate ideas or necessary truths. "By the word idea," he said, "I understand all that can be in our thoughts; and I distinguish three sorts of ideas;—adventitious, like the common idea of the sun; framed by the mind, such as that which astronomical reasoning gives of the sun; and innate, as the idea of God, or a triangle, and all others which represent true, immutable, and eternal essences."¹ Descartes's dogma of innate ideas, indeed, was the special dogma of his metaphysics, the necessary outcome of his primary axiom, "Cogito, ergo sum," and the battle-ground of the greatest psychological wars that have been waged since his time.

This is not the place for any discussion of Descartes's views. Some of them will have to be referred to hereafter, when we are considering Locke's position as a metaphysical teacher and the main points of his divergence from his first master in philosophy, the only guide whom he ever recognised as a master. Here it is only requisite to note, in as concise a way as may be, the sort of influences that that master exerted, or sought to exert, upon him. And in this connection it should be remembered that Descartes, however eminent as a metaphysician, was much besides a metaphysician. He may be regarded as almost the greatest modern

cold; it has colour, form, and size. Approach it to the fire: it becomes liquid, warm, inodorous, tasteless; its form and colour are changed; its size is increased. Does the same wax remain after these changes? It must be allowed that it does; no one doubts it; no one thinks otherwise. What was it then that we so distinctly knew to exist in this piece of wax? Nothing certainly that we observed by the senses, since all that the taste, the smell, the sight, the touch reported to us has disappeared, and yet the same wax remains."

¹ *Lettre liv.*

mathematician before Newton, his application of algebra to geometrical curves—concerning which, however, he appears to have purloined a good deal from Harriott or older mathematicians—being only one of many excellent services to this branch of science. He was also a great physiologist, “inasmuch,” we are told on high authority, “as he did for the physiology of motion and sensation that which Harvey had done for the circulation of the blood, and opened up the road to the mechanical theory of these processes which has been followed up by all his successors.”¹

And if the truths that he taught were thus useful, the vehemence of intellect that often led him far beyond the limits of known truth was not useless. “Bacon,” says Condorcet, “though he possessed in a most eminent degree the genius of philosophy, did not unite with it the genius of the sciences. The methods proposed by him for the investigation of truth, consisting entirely of precepts he was unable to verify, had little or no effect in accelerating the rate of discovery. That honour was reserved for Descartes. If in the physical sciences his march was less sure than that of Galileo, his logic was less cautious than that of Bacon, yet the very temerity of his errors was instrumental to the progress of human thought. He gave activity to minds which the circumspection of his rivals could not awaken from their lethargy. He called upon men to throw off the yoke of authority, and to acknowledge no dogma but what reason sanctioned; and his call was obeyed by a multitude of followers, encouraged by the boldness and fascinated by the enthusiasm of their leader.” No slight honour is due to Descartes, in addition to all his other claims to honour, for having set Locke thinking.

¹ Professor Huxley in the *Fortnightly Review* for November, 1874.

Of the way in which Locke began to think on philosophical questions two curious little illustrations have come down to us. They occur in a memorandum book belonging to his father, which has already furnished us with much interesting information, and in which are many other entries in Locke's handwriting, evidently made for his father's use or entertainment. As the elder Locke died in February, 1660-1, and the memorandum book then ceased to have any new entries made in it, there can be no doubt that they were written before the close of 1660. They are probably of a much earlier date.

“PHILOSOPHY.

“It is sorted into three parts, namely, Physic, Ethic and Dialectic.

“Physic is to discern and judge of the world and of such things as are therein.

“Ethic is to treat of life and manners.

“Dialectic, that is, Logic, to make reasons to grow, and improve both Physic and also Ethic, which is Moral Philosophy.

“*Moral Philosophy* is the knowledge of precepts of all honest manners which reason acknowledgeth to belong and appertain to man's nature, as the things [in] which we differ from beasts'. It is also necessary for the comely government of man's life.

“Necessity was the first finder-out of moral philosophy, and experience (which is a trusty teacher) was the first master thereof.

“Socrates is called by Laertius the first beginner thereof, because he taught it more than any of the rest (men must be the beginners of men's matters); notwithstanding the sages amongst the Athenians, as Thales and Solon, both spake and wrote of like matter before him, yet because he so earnestly embraced it, and equally placed it with th' other two sorts of Philosophy, he deserveth well the glory of the first beginner thereof.

“Plato, disciple of Socrates, in his book of moral wisdom, as well as many other of Plato's works, are full of divinity, as St. Augustine witnesseth.

“And therefore, because Socrates was before Jesus Sirach, the beginning thereof is to be referred unto him. As for Solomon's works, they are more divine than moral, and is rather to be worshipped in the divinity than honoured with the beginnings of moral philosophy.”

"OF THE KINDS OF TEACHING MORAL PHILOSOPHY.

"First, by counsels, laws, and precepts, counselling and admonishing men to virtue by precepts, and by laws deterring them from vice.

"Secondly, by proverbs and adages showing the contraries of things, preferring always the best, thereby declaring both the profit of virtue and inconveniences of vice.

"Thirdly, by parables, examples, and semblances, wherein by easy and familiar truths hard things and more out of use are declared, that by the one th' other may be better perceived and borne in mind."¹

The earliest, or nearly the earliest, of his extant compositions, those notes, short and crude as they are, throw some welcome light on Locke's temper as a young student in philosophy. "Men must be the beginners of men's matters." "Necessity was the first finder-out of moral philosophy, and experience (which is a trusty teacher) was the first master thereof." It would seem that Locke had already broken off, not only from Aristotelianism and scholasticism, but also from Cartesianism; or if, as is more likely, he wrote thus before he read Descartes, that he was prepared to accept from him only such guidance as would help him to become, not a Cartesian, but like Descartes, and with a firmer will and shrewder judgment, though not a keener intellect, a seeker after truth.

That Locke seriously set himself to that quest under the leadership of Descartes, while he was an Oxford student, we are positively informed. That he supplemented or joined with his study of Descartes the study of other great writers contemporary with him, or coming a little after him, cannot be doubted. But, without records to support us, we should not be justified in speculating as to the range of his extra-university studies at this early stage of his life. We only know, from state-

¹ *Additional MSS.*, no. 28273, in the British Museum.

ments, references, and allusions made by him at later dates, that before he ventured to write, or at any rate to publish what he wrote, on philosophical subjects he had acquainted himself with nearly every work of importance that had been offered to the world for its enlightenment or mystification on those subjects, had digested and assimilated all that was fit to add strength and vigour to the operations of his mind, and had rejected all that he found unsuited to his mental constitution; and we are only warranted in assuming that this process was entered upon, and had begun to be necessary to him, long before he ceased to be an Oxford student. In building up his own opinions he derived instruction alike from the new Epicureanism of Gassendi, from the new Democritism of Hobbes, and from the teachings, new or newly coloured, of other men of mark.

However zealous and comprehensive may have been Locke's studies in philosophy during this portion of his life, its political and social conditions can hardly have had less effect in shaping his character and conduct, and their influence was more immediately important.

Though the name of John Owen is not honoured by the champions of state and church authority at Oxford, the university was fortunate in having him for its ruler during part of the Commonwealth period; and, though there may not have been much intercourse between them, it is evident that Locke's debt to him was a large one. Owen's firm government rendered sound education possible. His liberality enabled the students to choose their studies from a wider range than could have been expected. But perhaps his greatest merit of all consisted

in the good sense and honesty with which he preached, almost for the first time, the full doctrine of religious toleration; and in this respect he was not only a benefactor to all, but a direct teacher to Locke.

Toleration in religious matters had, it is true, been eloquently insisted upon before this time. But there is not much charity, nor even much political shrewdness, in the demand of persecuted people for liberty to think and worship as they choose. It is an altogether different thing for men who are not persecuted to urge that there shall be no persecution of those who differ from them on important or even unimportant matters of belief. In old times it was, of course, not at all uncommon for rulers, having power to punish heretics, to abstain from doing so. Good nature, or apathy, or clandestine sympathy prevented it; and from like motives a lenient policy was from time to time recommended by persons who were not rulers. Such recommendations, however, were made rarely, and only by those who, themselves or through their friends, were interested in the result of the lenient policy suggested. So it was with Jeremy Taylor, and even to some extent with Milton, the most famous advocates and claimants of toleration in the early years of the Commonwealth. "I never knew one contend earnestly for a toleration of dissenters, who was not one himself," Owen said with truth in 1646.¹ In preaching toleration in the broader sense, Owen was nearly the first apostle of a new gospel.

The temper of most or many of Owen's fellow-puritans, and especially of the presbyterians, was very different. Never was there a time in which religious tyranny was so openly insisted upon as in those years, or so much rhetoric

¹ Orme, 'Memoirs of Owen,' p. 58.

was used in denouncing "pretended liberty of conscience." "A toleration," we are told in one of the many treatises then written, "is the grand design of the devil, his masterpiece and chief engine he works by at this time to uphold his tottering kingdom. It is the most compendious, ready, sure way to destroy all religion, lay all waste, and bring in all evil. It is a most transcendent, catholic, and fundamental evil for this kingdom of any one that can be imagined. As original sin is the most fundamental sin, having the seed and spawn of all in it, so a toleration hath all errors in it, and all evils. It is against the whole stream and current of Scripture, both in the Old and New Testament, both in matters of faith and manners, both general and particular commands. It overthrows all relations, political, ecclesiastical, and economical. And whereas other evils, whether of judgment or practice, be but against some one or two places of Scripture or relation, this is against all, this is the Abaddon, Apollyon, the destroyer of all religion, the abomination of desolation and astonishment, the liberty of perdition; and therefore the devil follows it night and day, working mightily in many by writing books for it and other ways, all the devils in hell and their instruments being at work to promote a toleration."¹

Owen issued his first protest in favour of this concentration of diabolical mischief in 1646, when he was a presbyterian, and, presbyterianism being in the ascendant, he could ask no more toleration for himself or his own friends than his party was able and willing to yield. Before 1649 he had become an independent, and in that year, having Cromwell for his friend, and the friend of his fellow-religionists, he still had no persecution to fear. In

¹ Edwards, 'Gangræna,' cited by Orme, p. 43.

1649, however, his opinions on toleration were more liberal and outspoken than in 1646. To the published copy of his famous sermon on the execution of Charles the First he appended a treatise 'Of Toleration,' in which he defended the Bible from the charge of sanctioning persecution, and urged that the magistrate has no right to interfere with the religion of any one whose faith does not prompt him to violate peace and good order. "Gospel constitutions," he said, "in the case of heresy or error seem not to favour any course of violence, I mean, of civil penalties. Foretold it is that heresies must be, but this is for the manifesting of those that are approved, not the destroying of those that are not." "Admonitions, and excommunications upon rejection of admonitions, are the highest constitutions against heretics, waiting with all patience on them that oppose themselves, if at any time God will give them repentance to the acknowledgment of the truth. Imprisoning, banishing, slaying, is scarcely a patient waiting. God doth not so wait on unbelievers. Perhaps those who call for the sword on earth are as unacquainted with their own spirits as those that called for fire from heaven; and perhaps the parable of the tares gives us a positive rule as to this whole business."¹ Often before that had toleration been sued for by those who sought it for themselves. Never before had it been so honestly proclaimed by one of the party in power to be due even to those whom he regarded as heretics. We must measure the difference between these two positions, in order to do justice to Owen's sound views on toleration.

Others shared and expressed the same views in the years that followed, Milton most notably of all, and Cromwell favoured them to some extent. To his short-lived parlia-

¹ Orme, p. 103.

ment of 1654, Cromwell presented this instrument of government: "That such as profess faith in God by Jesus Christ, though differing in judgment from the doctrine, worship, and discipline publicly held forth, shall not be restrained from, but shall be protected in, the profession of their faith and exercise of their religion, so as they abuse not this liberty to the civil injury of others and to the actual disturbance of the public peace on their parts, provided this liberty be not extended to popery or prelacy, or to such as, under a profession of Christ, hold forth and practise licentiousness."¹ There are a good many limitations there, and loopholes for limitations enough to turn the promised toleration into a new tyranny. To a modern critic the document seems altogether lame, crippled, and retrogressive; but judged by Tudor and Stuart standards of legislation, it was actually as well as possibly a great step forward. It dimly recognised the grand principle which Owen worthily advocated, according to his light, and which Locke was soon to propound with unrivalled clearness and force, that it is the duty of the state to show complete toleration towards all religious opinions, and towards all the acts of religionists which are not, under a cloak of religion, designed to oppose and subvert the civil power.

Of Owen's practical adoption of his tolerant principles there is abundant evidence. All through his vice-chancellorship at Oxford it is clear that, while anxious to promote the cause of independency, which he zealously served by preaching and writing, as well as by exercise of his official powers, he showed great and unusual liberality towards those from whom he differed on religious matters. Dr. Willis, Dr. Fell, and the other staunch

¹ Neal, 'History of the Puritans,' (1754), vol. iv., p. 74.

churchmen then at Oxford, never thanked him for it; but, had he not winked at their procedure, it would hardly have been possible for them to have carried on their daily services according to the rubric of the church of England, in days when such worship was regarded as heathenish and intolerable.¹

If Owen's policy of toleration tended to win converts to independency, however, Locke was not one of the number. He learnt wisdom, but not dogma, from the vice-chancellor. It would seem that he became less rather than more of a puritan under the puritan rule at Oxford. Many, if not most of his friends, as far as we know, were churchmen. There is nothing to show that he ever shared their extreme views; but there is also nothing to show that he ever had much sympathy with the dominant party on religious, as apart from political, matters. There cannot be much doubt that he already held the opinions, to some extent at any rate, of those latitudinarian members of the church who were rising in importance under the living and posthumous influence of such men as Chillingworth, Cudworth, and Tillotson.

The progress of parties and party-government, political and religious, at Oxford and throughout England, in the later years of the Commonwealth, was not of the sort to turn a young philosopher into a hot puritan.

Cromwell's dallying with the proposal that he should take the title of king was only a prelude to the change that was to be effected, a token that the premature outburst

¹ Anthony Wood records that, all through the time of puritan rule, Dr. Willis had daily sacraments performed in his house, according to the rubric of the church of England, and that these services were attended by his brother-in-law, John Fell, afterwards dean of Christ Church, John Dolben, Richard Allestree, and others.

of English republicanism had already nearly spent itself. We are told that when, in May, 1657, Colonel Desborow and his friends were resolved to prevent Cromwell's assumption of the kingship, they went to Owen, then in London, and induced him to draw up that "petition of certain officers" to the parliament which set forth "that they had hazarded their lives against monarchy, and were still ready to do so in defence of the liberties of the nation; and that, having observed in some men great endeavours to bring the nation again under the old servitude by pressing their general to take upon him the title and government of king, in order to destroy him and weaken the hands of those who were faithful to the public, they, therefore, humbly desired they would discountenance all such persons and endeavours, and continue steadfast to the old cause."¹ Perhaps Cromwell never knew of Owen's share in keeping from him the crown that he coveted; but from this time Owen was out of favour at Whitehall.

In July, Cromwell resigned the chancellorship of Oxford, and his son Richard took his place. In September, Richard Cromwell dismissed Owen from the vice-chancellorship, and gave the office to Dr. John Conant, a rigid presbyterian. Thirty months later, in March, 1659-60, Owen was also, by a committee of the house of commons, removed from the deanery of Christ Church, which was restored to Dr. Edward Reynolds, the presbyterian whom Owen had displaced in March, 1650-1.²

The rule of the presbyterians was harder than that of the independents. As one instance of this it may be noted that in December, 1657, almost immediately after

¹ Ludlow, 'Memoirs,' (1721), vol ii., p. 588.

² Wood, 'History and Antiquities of Oxford,' vol. ii., p. 695.

Conant's appointment, an order was issued, requiring, in addition to the various religious exercises already established, the attendance of all students at public catechising every Saturday afternoon between five and six o'clock.¹ Before Owen and the independents undertook the management of affairs at Oxford, the university had been in hopeless confusion. When the presbyterians resumed the leadership, confusion did not perhaps at once begin again, but the seeds of it were sown. It was at Oxford as it was in the country at large. Of Cromwell's power, dwindling down during the last years of his life, only a shadow was inherited by his son, and that shadow gradually melted away, until Richard Cromwell was forced to abandon an office he had never been competent to hold, and the Rump Parliament existed just long enough to enable plots and counter-plots to work, and the restoration of Charles the Second to be effected.

We can understand how in these years Locke gradually lost all, or nearly all, the puritanism that had been instilled into him by his father; how, while learning to become an able advocate for religious and political liberty, he came to think that there was more hope of attaining these under Charles the Second than under a small tyranny of rival officers and sectaries, with only the Rump Parliament to give unheeded sanction to their proceedings.

There is no record of any visit paid by Locke to his old home after he left Pensford to become a Westminster boy in 1646. There can be no doubt, however, that he paid many such visits in vacation time, especially after he went

¹ *Queen's College MSS.*, cited in the appendix to the Fourth Report of the Historical Manuscripts Commission (1874), p. 457.

to Oxford. We have already heard from Lady Masham that his father, "keeping him in much awe, and at a distance when he was a boy, relaxed of that severity as he grew up to be a man, till, he being become capable of it, he lived perfectly with him as a friend." That statement implies that there was much personal intimacy between the father and the son, up to the time of the father's death.

It is unfortunate that we know so little of this intimacy. Very welcome, though quite inadequate, illustration of it appears, however, in the following letter, the earliest of Locke's writing that we have, and the only one addressed to his father. It is dated merely "Dec. 20," but it may be fairly assumed to have been written from Oxford in 1660—certainly it was not written later. The Dr. Meary referred to in it was Dr. Edmund Meary—in Latin, Edmondus de Meara, a fellow of the London college of physicians, and the principal doctor then practising in Bristol.¹ The allusion to "another, whom you may guess," cannot be explained; but we may reasonably guess that "another" was a lady.

"MOST DEAR AND EVER-LOVING FATHER,—I did not doubt but that the noise of a very dangerous sickness here would reach you, but I am alarmed with a more dangerous disease from Pensford, and were I as secure of your health as (I thank God) I am of my own, I should not think myself in danger; but I cannot be safe so long as I hear of your weakness, and that increase of your malady upon you, which I beg that you would, by the timely application of remedies, endeavour to remove. Dr. Meary has more

¹ Not a very wise one, however, as it appears from a controversy in which he was engaged with Dr. Willis, of Oxford, author of 'The Anatomy of the Brain,' and with Willis's pupil, Richard Lower, Locke's schoolfellow and college companion, that he denied Harvey's discovery of the circulation of the blood, supporting instead Galen's doctrine of the four humours, and that he also repudiated all the discoveries of Descartes and every other modern physiologist.—*Biographia Britannica*, pp. 3009, 4293.

than once put a stop to its encroachment. The same skill, the same means, the same God to bless you, is left still. Do not, I beseech you, by that care you ought to have of yourself, by that tenderness I am sure you have of us, neglect your own and our safety too; do not, by a too pressing care for your children, endanger the only comfort they have left. I cannot distrust that Providence which hath conducted us thus far; and if either your disappointments or necessities shall reduce us to narrower conditions than you could wish, content shall enlarge it; therefore, let not these thoughts distress you. There is nothing that I have which can be so well employed as to his use from whom I first received it; and if your convenience can leave me nothing else, I shall have a head and hands and industry still left me, which alone have been able to raise sufficient fortunes. Pray, sir, therefore, make your life as comfortable and lasting as you can; let not any consideration of us cast you into the least despondency. If I have any reflections on, or desires of, free and competent subsistence, it is more in reference to another (whom you may guess) to whom I am very much obliged, than for myself: but no thoughts, how important soever, shall make me forget my duty; and a father is more than all other relations; and the greatest satisfaction I can propose to myself in the world is my hopes that you may yet live to receive the return of some comfort for all that care and indulgence you have placed in,

“ Sir, your most obedient son,

“ J. L.”¹

The son's hopes were not realized. Though the elder Locke was only fifty-four years old, his malady was one that Dr. Meary could not baffle. On the 15th of December, 1660, he made his will, bequeathing his house at Pensford, with its grounds, stables, and other appurtenances, to his eldest son John, and the residue of his property to his other son Thomas; his brother, Peter Locke, being one of the overseers and trustees.² That will was not proved till 1663; but John Locke the elder died on the 13th of February, 1660-1.³

¹ Lord King, p. 2; Locke to his Father, 20 Dec. [1660].

² The document is in the repository of wills at Wells.

³ Publow Parish Register.

Of Thomas Locke, born in 1637, we only know that he died of consumption, leaving no children, soon after his father.¹ It is probable that his share of the family estate then passed to his brother.²

What was the exact value of the property that came to Locke from his father is not stated. We have already learnt that it was much less than old Nicholas Locke had left, and the letter just quoted clearly shows that its "narrowed condition" was a source of serious trouble to the dying man, who had hoped to bequeath to his son a "free and competent subsistence." If, however, it was not enough to justify Locke in marrying, as he seems to have been inclined to do, it was enough to add much to the comfort of a quiet student provided also with free quarters and a moderate allowance from his college.

Seven years later Locke appears to have owned land and houses in Pensford and its vicinity, which he let in portions to thirteen different persons, and which yielded an aggregate rental of 73*l.* 6*s.* 10*d.*,³ represented by more than 200*l.* of the present value of money; and in his correspondence in 1666 and afterwards we find occasional references to his lands and tenants in Somersetshire; but there is nothing to show whether all this property was bequeathed to him by his father, or whether any part of it was acquired in other ways. In the management of

¹ *MSS. in the Remonstrants' Library*; Lady Masham to Le Clerc, 12 Jan., 1704-5.

² A Thomas Locke, who must have died between the 23rd of November, 1663, when he made a will (now at Wells) leaving his property to his wife and child, and the 4th of February, 1663-4, when the will was proved, was probably our John Locke's uncle.

³ There is extant in Locke's handwriting a list of tenants, and the amounts due from each for the two half-years ending Michaelmas, 1667, and Lady-day, 1668.—*Shaftesbury Papers*, series viii., no. 30.

this property he seems to have been chiefly assisted by Peter Locke, his father's younger brother, and the only one who lived to be an old man. He was in frequent intercourse with this uncle and with the Keenes, his mother's kinsfolk, who continued to reside in and near Wrington, but was not himself very often in Somersetshire.

CHAPTER III.

FURTHER RESIDENCE AT OXFORD.

[1660—1667.]

THE restoration of Charles the Second to the throne from which his father had been deposed by the most irrevocable of all decrees, and the consequent revival of Stuart institutions, produced nowhere else a greater revolution than at Oxford, though the change was less sudden, and, except on the surface of university life, less complete than that which had occurred twelve years before.

The old order of things was of course re-established, and every effort made to remove all trace of the presbyterian and puritan supremacy by which, it was thought, the greatest school and most favourite haunt of episcopalian orthodoxy had been defiled. Most of the headships and other offices in the various colleges were either restored to their former occupants or assigned to new claimants from the party now in power; and the students were required either to quit the university or to conform to the prescriptions and shibboleths of the re-established church. But the change of rulers and of ruled hardly went beyond that for some time. Its chief effect was to drive away some violent and some honest sectaries, to convert a few puritans into hypocrites, and to enable a great many royalists to throw off the cloak of hypocrisy that

they had been wearing for several years.¹ It did not very materially affect the position of a large number of men, who, latitudinarian under the Commonwealth, were able quite honestly to fall in with the arrangements of the Restoration, and of whom Dr. Wallis, the Savilian professor of geometry, may be regarded as a type and spokesman. "It hath been my lot," he said, "to live in a time wherein have been many and great changes and alterations. It hath been my endeavour all along to act by moderate principles, between the extremities on either hand, in a moderate compliance with the powers in being, in those places where it hath been my lot to live, without the fierce and violent animosities usual in such cases against all that did not act just as I did, knowing that there were many worthy persons engaged on either side; and willing, whatever side was upmost, to promote, as I was able, any good design for the true interest of religion,

¹ "The hopes of this" (the Restoration), said a royalist Oxonian of the day, who it is to be hoped exaggerated the temper and conduct of those members of the university who had been concealing their political and social inclinations during the Commonwealth, "made the scholars talk aloud, drink healths, and curse Meroz in the very streets; insomuch that when the king came in—nay, when the king was but voted in—they were not only like them that dream, but like them who are out of their wits, mad, stark staring mad. To study was fanaticism; to be moderate was downright rebellion. And thus it continued for a twelvemonth; and thus it would have continued till this time if it had not pleased God to raise up some vice-chancellors who stemmed the torrent which carried so much filth with it, and—in defiance of the loyal zeal of the learned, the drunken zeal of dunces, and the great amazement of young gentlemen who really knew not what they would have, but yet made the greatest noise—reduced the university to that temperament that a man might study and not be thought a dullard, might be sober and yet a conformist, a scholar and yet a Church of England man; and from that time the university became sober, modest, and studious as perhaps any university in Europe."—Stephen Penton, 'The Guardian's Instructor, or the Gentleman's Romance' (1688), p. 44.

of learning, and the public good ; and ready so to do good offices as there was opportunity, and, if things could not be just as I could wish, to make the best of what is.”¹

It was on that sound principle that Locke proceeded. Therefore, having been eight years at Oxford during the Commonwealth, he maintained his connection with the university for four and twenty years longer—until it was broken for him by order of Charles the Second.

He welcomed the change when it came, and, during the first few years, found no reason to regret it. He had seen enough of the disorder and tyranny incident to the management of the university by the presbyterians while they were vainly endeavouring to keep alive their dying cause. He had good ground for hoping that a far better state of things would result from the promises given by Charles the Second to those who, in the name of the English nation, had offered him the crown; and his hopes seemed for some time in the way of being realized. The new rulers of the university were not men of great eminence, but for the most part they governed it temperately and wisely. As good order as was practicable under the Stuart revival was maintained, and many of the academical and scholastic improvements effected by Dr. Owen and his companions were adopted, or even further improved upon.

His own position and prospects were bettered by the change. On the 24th of December, 1660, he was appointed Greek lecturer or reader for the ensuing year. Whether he continued to hold the office during 1662 is not recorded ; but on the 24th of December in that year he was appointed reader or lecturer on rhetoric for 1663,

¹ Hearne, ‘Peter Langtoft’s Chronicle’ (1725), vol. i. (the Publisher’s Appendix to his Preface), p. clxix.

and on the following Christmas Eve he was appointed censor of moral philosophy for 1664.¹ These dates, unfortunately, tell all that is to be said about Locke's connection with the posts thus assigned to him. It does not appear that he held any others of a public sort in the university.

It would seem, however, that he occupied much of his time during the first few years after the Restoration in acting as tutor to a few of the younger students at Oxford, though on this point also we have very scanty information. In 1661 and 1662 he had, at any rate, two pupils, Thomas Harborne and Henry Clayton, and in 1663 another named Townshend;² and it is probable not only that his rela-

¹ Lord Grenville, 'Oxford and Locke' (1829), p. 50.

² This appears from some loose sheets in Locke's handwriting, torn out of an account-book, of which the remainder has disappeared, and from other stray scraps and fragments preserved among the *Shaftesbury Papers* (series viii., no. 30). Locke received 10*l.* from Thomas Harborne's father on the 16th of January, 1661-2, and 5*l.* from Harborne himself on the 25th of the month. On Henry Clayton's account he received 5*l.* on the 22nd of March, 1661-2. This short account, relating to Townshend, and dated the 14th of February, 1662-3, is endorsed by Locke, but written in a strange handwriting, evidently that of the young man's father:—

<i>Disbursements.</i>			
By your first note	£13	10	3
By your second note	8	10	10
For tutorage half a year, not set down by you	2	0	0
			£24 1 1
<i>Receipts.</i>			
Paid to you by my son	10	0	0
Paid by the carrier	5	0	0
By Mr. Robert Wyld	8	10	0
			£23 10 0
Remaining due to you			11 1
Sent up with this note			£5 11 1

tions with these young men extended beyond the years about which we have positive knowledge, but that in these and later years he had several other pupils.¹

Was it to help him in obtaining tutorial work that Locke procured from the dean and canons of Christ Church the following certificate of good character and conduct, which he endorsed 'Testimonial,' and treasured up among his papers?—

"Omnibus in Christi fidelibus ad quos praesens hoc scriptum pervenerit nos pro uniuscujusque persona merito et dignitate debitam et omnimodam reverentiam.

"Cum Joannes Locke, Artium Magister et Alumnus Aedis Christi in Academia Oxoniensi, certis de causis ipsum in hac parte moventibus, Literas nostras Testimoniales de vita sua laudabili et morum integritate sibi concedi petierit, nos quorum nomina subscribuntur tam honesta ejus petitione volentes (quantum in nobis est) obsecundare Testamur per praesentes dictum Joannem Locke per annos illos quibus apud nos vixit sedulam honestis studiis dedisse operam, vitamque suam et mores piè sobrièque semper instituisse, praeterea in illis rebus quae ad religionem spectant nihil unquam aut tenuisse aut credidisse quod sciamus nisi quod Ecclesia Anglicana approbat et tuetur. In cujus rei testimonium nomina nostra subscripsimus.

"JOANNES FELL, Ecclesiae Xti Decanus.

"EDW. POCOCKE, ejusdem Ecclesiae Subdecanus.

"RICH. GARDINER, ejusd. Eccl. Canonicus.

"Octob. 4, 1663." ²

Of the senior studentships of Christ Church it was

¹ From the tone and purport of the letter to John Alford which will be quoted at the close of this chapter, it may fairly be assumed that Alford was a former pupil of Locke's, now passed out of his immediate charge.

Mrs. Blomer, writing to Locke from Paris on the 24th of January, 1669-70, said in a postscript, "Sir C. B., your pupil, took this place in his way home; but I did not care to say anything to you by so great a courtier."—*Shaftesbury Papers*, series viii., no. 20.

² *Shaftesbury Papers*, series viii., no. 22.

prescribed by the statutes of the college that fifty-five should be held by men in holy orders, or preparing themselves for the clerical office. Only five were open to laymen, there being two "faculty studentships" in medicine, two in law, and one in moral philosophy. These open studentships were much sought after by those Christ Church graduates who did not care to become clergymen;¹ but most Christ Church graduates became clergymen as a matter of course, and the cleverest among them rarely had any difficulty in obtaining one or other of the ordinary studentships.

As Locke must have obtained such a studentship in 1658 or 1659, when there was no church of England, and when all university laws in its favour were in abeyance, he was probably not then called upon to decide as to his future profession; and perhaps he was not called upon for any formal decision until long after the church of England and all its privileges had been restored. But it is most likely that, without pledging himself to any course of action, he had serious thoughts of entering the church, and that with this prospect, if not on this understanding, he was not only allowed to hold his studentship somewhat irregularly, but was appointed to the college readerships in Greek and rhetoric, and to the censorship of moral philosophy, which he held between 1661 and 1664—offices usually assigned to clergymen. This appears to have been the calling that his father intended

¹ "I have been out of my place" (as a student of Christ Church), wrote Richard Lower to Robert Boyle, on the 24th of June, 1664, "above a year and a half since, for not being in holy orders, without which I could not keep my student's place, unless I can get a physician's place in the college, there being two allowed, but I had not the favour of friendship to obtain either."—Boyle, 'Works' (1744), vol. v., p. 525.

him to follow,¹ and it is clear, not only that he did not finally abandon it until 1666, but that he was frequently urged to adopt it by influential friends, some of whom professed themselves able and willing to procure for him high preferment in the church. A letter written by him in 1666, to one of these friends, resident in Dublin, tells us that much in a very characteristic way.

“The proposals, no question,” he here said, “are very considerable; but consider, a man’s affairs and whole life are not to be changed in a moment, and one is not made fit for a calling in a day. I believe you think me too proud to undertake anything wherein I should acquit myself but unworthily. I am sure I cannot content myself with being undermost, possibly middlemost, of my profession; and, you will allow, care is to be taken not to engage in a calling wherein, if one chance to be a bungler, there is no retreat. A person must needs be very quick or inconsiderate that can on a sudden resolve to transplant himself from a country, affairs, and study upon probability which, though your interest there may make you

¹ Lady Masham reported, as we saw in the last chapter, that, in the early years of his university life, Locke “wished his father had rather designed him for anything else than what he was destined to, apprehending that his no greater progress in knowledge proceeded from his not being fitted or capacitated to be a scholar.” Excellence in such scholarship as Locke found distasteful to him was not much looked for in any but clergymen. The elder Locke, like his son, appears to have been a very religious man. We do not know whether, though siding with the puritans in politics, he shared their opposition to the episcopal church; but, even if that were the case, it would hardly affect his plans for his son’s training. Many of Locke’s contemporaries at Westminster were young puritans designed for the ministerial office, and during the Commonwealth, no less than in the times before and after, the Westminster scholarships, with the Oxford and Cambridge studentships to which they generally led, were regarded as proper and convenient passages to that office.

look on as certain, yet my want of fitness may probably disappoint." "Should I put myself into orders, and, by the meanness of my abilities, grow unworthy such expectations (for you do not think that divines are now made, as formerly, by inspiration and on a sudden, nor learning caused by laying on of hands), I unavoidably lose all my former study, and put myself into a calling that will not leave me." "The same considerations have made me a long time reject very advantageous offers of several very considerable friends in England. I cannot now be forward to disgrace you, or any one else, by being lifted into a place which perhaps I cannot fill, and from whence there is no descending without tumbling."¹

Whatever thoughts Locke may have had about taking holy orders, therefore, were finally abandoned in 1666;² and in the years before that date he had accumulated results of "former study" which he did not care to lose, and had devoted himself to pursuits from which he was not willing to "transplant himself." The calling that he preferred to any employment in the church, however lucrative it might be, which his friends could find for him and urge upon him, was that of medicine.

It is probable that Locke did not resolve to be a physician, instead of a clergyman, till in or near this year 1666. He seems to have been wavering between the two professions for some time after the Restoration, and to have been gradually drawn, by discovery of his own tastes and capacities, from the latter to the former. He seems also to have been gradually led to make a

¹ Lord King, p. 27. Only Locke's draft of the letter has been preserved, and the name of his correspondent is not shown in it.

² This view is confirmed by Charles the Second's "dispensation," which will be quoted hereafter.

special study of medicine after applying himself to the study of physical science in general.

In thus applying himself, he only shared the enthusiasm that was stirred up among nearly all his friends by the recent example and teaching of Bacon, though, like many of them, he may have been most strongly induced to enter on the study by the teaching and example of Descartes. Descartes was really, if not avowedly, Bacon's rival, and a very successful rival, in the field of experimental philosophy which is often regarded as especially Bacon's own. Bacon was the great apostle of the inductive method, which his disciples looked upon as the only key to the development of modern science; but Descartes, the great apostle of the deductive method, did vastly more in the way of actual scientific discovery. Baconian investigation of science, indeed, seems to have been chiefly stirred into active life by the more recently born Cartesian system. They loyally and heartily acknowledged their obligations to the great Englishman; but it was the '*Discours de la Méthode*,' much more than the '*De Augmentis*,' that quickened the zeal of those friends and acquaintances of Locke whose great merit was that they for the first time recognised and insisted upon the possibility of establishing scientific research as a regular and co-operative pursuit for earnest and competent men of science.

The English men of science before this time had been few, though some of them of excellent genius. William Harvey, the most eminent of all, had discovered the circulation of the blood in 1615, and had thus given a wonderful impetus to all physiological and kindred studies; and able mathematicians, like Napier, Harriott, and Horrocks, had encouraged others to make fresh dis-

coveries in their own departments of research. But it may almost be said that science was an exotic in England till quite the middle of the seventeenth century, when Descartes's new books began to be read, and Bacon's old ones to be studied. Then it became naturalised, and grew in all sorts of soil with almost unhealthy rapidity.

During Locke's student years Oxford was the place in which it grew most luxuriantly. The organisation that ultimately took shape in the Royal Society had London for its first home; but the civil war drove most of its founders to Oxford, and there, under the leadership of Wallis and Wilkins and some others, with eager supporters of a younger generation, like Christopher Wren and Robert Boyle, the movement thrived amazingly. Boyle, indeed, at whose lodgings the Oxford club met during some years, both before and after the Royal Society was duly established in London, was, by virtue of his great abilities and the versatility of his talents, as well as on account of his wealth and social position, almost the centre of the famous scientific circle to which Locke belonged, and in which he learned, if not to dabble in all the subjects over which his friends divided their interest, to pay particular and deep attention to some of them.

One of these was chemistry. In 1663 we find him attending the lectures of Peter Stahl, "a Lutheran and a great hater of women,"¹ as well as a great chemist, whom, at Hartlib's recommendation, Boyle had brought to Oxford in 1659,² and who during several years after that date gave instruction to small classes of pupils,

¹ Wood, 'Life,' prefixed to his 'Athenæ Oxonienses,' vol. i., p. lii.

² Boyle, 'Works,' vol. v., pp. 287, 295.

some of whom were the most distinguished members of the university.¹

That during the few years following the Restoration, if not also before that time, Locke studied other branches of science besides chemistry is certain; and there can be no doubt that in these years he made a particular study of medicine, and thus gradually and thoroughly qualified himself for the calling to which he ultimately resolved to devote his energies. But, unfortunately, we have no details as to his occupations in these ways.

His academical offices and his medical and other studies must have given Locke plenty to do during his residence at Oxford between 1660 and 1667; and there is nothing to show that he took very great interest in the progress of political affairs and in public events beyond the university limits. It is not possible, however, that he should have been quite heedless of the movements in the outside world, especially as some of his college friends, with whom he afterwards kept up a correspondence, had left Oxford to take part in them.

Of these college friends who became politicians, the most memorable, as far as Locke was concerned, seeing that his introduction to the outside world seems to have

¹ Anthony Wood was one of the ten or more who attended Stahl's lectures along with Locke in 1663. "This John Locke," said Wood, who never lost an opportunity of maligning him, "was a man of a turbulent spirit, clamorous, and never contented. The club wrote and took notes from the mouth of their master, who sat at the upper end of a table; but the said John Locke scorned to do it; so that while every man of the club besides were writing, he would be prating and troublesome" ('Life,' p. lii.). It is not in the least likely that Wood's assertion as to Locke's prating and turbulence is true; but it is quite possible that he may not have found the teacher's lectures worth entering in his note book.

been partly due to him, was perhaps William Godolphin, his sometime schoolfellow, and elder brother of the more famous Sydney Godolphin, who became lord high treasurer, and of whom Charles the Second, regarding him as the perfection of a courtier, is reported to have said, "Sydney Godolphin is never in the way and never out of the way." Locke's schoolfellow was not quite so fortunate, but he also had done much to earn King Charles's favour. Proceeding from Westminster to Oxford a year before Locke, he was not made master of arts till 1661, and then only by nomination of the crown.¹ Though he appears to have been generally in residence at Christ Church, he was too busy about politics to attend closely to university studies. He was the intimate friend and agent of Sir Henry Bennet, afterwards Earl of Arlington, also a Westminster scholar and Christ Church student, some ten years older than Godolphin; and while Bennet was following the exiled uncrowned king on the continent, and was acting as secretary to the king's brother James, Godolphin was secretly doing all that it was possible for him to do towards procuring the restoration of the Stuarts. It seems strange that there should have been much intimacy between him and Locke; but perhaps his strong partisanship was not then generally known even to his fellow-students at Oxford. After the Restoration, Godolphin profited by his loyalty. He was a member of Charles the Second's first parliament, which assembled in May, 1661, "whereupon," we are told, "showing himself zealous for the prerogative, he had several boons conferred upon him."² He became secretary to Sir Henry Bennet,

¹ 'Alumni Westmonasterienses,' p. 136; Wood, 'Fasti Oxonienses,' part ii., col. 229.

² Wood, 'Fasti Oxonienses,' part ii., col. 275.

who was appointed principal secretary of state in October, 1662, and during the next few years he rose with his friend's rise. The state papers of the time abound with evidences of his zeal as a public servant and of his influence at court.

The court was then by no means so corrupt as it afterwards became, nor was the corruption that did exist generally apparent. Honest men yet hoped that honesty would triumph, and the more moderate patriots had hardly begun to regret that the Stuarts had been brought back again. The parliament of 1661 showed itself very violent in its support of high church measures; but the significance of the corporation act and the act of uniformity was not fully discovered; and if Lord Chancellor Clarendon and his party lost popularity on account of them, younger politicians like Sir Henry Bennet—who was not then known to be a catholic—and Lord Ashley, afterwards Earl of Shaftesbury, gained favour, and revived drooping hopes by their advocacy of a more liberal policy. The lawless execution of Sir Henry Vane, in May, 1662, when Charles broke his solemn promise to the Convention Parliament, shocked the nation, but excuse was found for it in the king's eagerness to avenge his father's death; and his majesty's "declaration of indulgence," in December of the same year, issued at Bennet's and Ashley's instigation, was thought to expiate sufficiently the ejection of the two thousand nonconformist ministers in the previous August—or, if further expiation was wanted, it came in the dispensing bill, which, though it was shelved in committee, occupied much time and attention during the parliamentary session of 1663. Locke may not up to this time, or for some time to come, have seen much ground for dissatisfaction with Charles the Second's government.

His first actual sight of royalty probably occurred in September, 1663, when the king went to Oxford, and lodged at Christ Church. The party, comprising Charles and his newly married wife Catherine, the Duke of York and his wife Anne, with a large retinue which included Sir Henry Bennet and William Godolphin, arrived on the 23rd of the month, and was met by the students, Locke doubtless being among them, who formed a guard of honour, with Dr. Fell, the dean of Christ Church, at their head.¹ On the following Sunday the king and his party attended service at Christ Church Cathedral, when Dr. Fell preached "a seasonable and excellent sermon;"² and on the 28th there was a grand celebration of the event in the university, and a giving away of honorary degrees, on which occasion both Bennet and Godolphin were made doctors of civil law.³

That royal visit may have had no effect upon Locke's career. Just two years later, however, the court was again at Oxford for a longer time, and the consequences to Locke were of some importance. The great plague having broken out in London in the spring of 1665, Charles and all his subjects who were not compelled to remain in town fled to the country, and, after seeking shelter at Salisbury and elsewhere, the king resolved to pass the autumn at Oxford, and to hold there a short session of parliament. He arrived, with his court, on the 23rd of September,⁴ and remained till after Christmas. Bennet, now Baron Arlington, was at this time

¹ *Domestic State Papers, Reign of Charles II.*, in the Record Office, vol. lxxx., no. 119.

² *Ibid.*

³ Wood, 'Fasti Oxonienses,' part ii., col. 275.

Domestic State Papers, Reign of Charles II., vol. cxxxiii, no. 34.

the most influential of his advisers, though Clarendon was still in considerable favour; and Godolphin was, as he had been, Arlington's right-hand man. With them also was another of Locke's old school-fellows, Joseph Williamson, principal secretary of state in 1674, and now joint-secretary with Godolphin to Arlington. There was some, but apparently not much, intimacy between him and Locke.

The session of parliament at Oxford, which lasted from the 9th till the 31st of October, was specially convened in order that an additional supply might be obtained for carrying on the indefensible war with Holland that had been formally begun in February. If Locke, as may be almost taken for granted, sometimes attended the debates, his attention must have been roused by a curious discussion on the royal prerogative which sprang out of this business. The money asked for was readily voted; but there was considerable opposition to a proviso introduced into the bill, "to make all the money to be raised by this bill to be applied only to those ends to which it was given, which was the carrying on the war, and to no other purpose whatsoever, by what authority soever." The proviso was enforced, and the principle of "appropriation clauses," now such an important guarantee for the proper expenditure of public money, was for the first time established. Strange to say, however, the clause, introduced with Charles's concurrence, was approved by him all through the passage of the bill, and its chief opponents were Clarendon, Arlington, and Ashley, rivals banded together to preserve for the king a mischievous prerogative that he was quite willing to surrender. Charles may not have been shrewd enough to see the whole import of the innovation; but this is not the only occasion on

which, contemptible as he was, he showed himself less tyrannical than his advisers.

One or two glaring instances of tyranny upon which both the king and his advisers were agreed cannot have escaped Locke's notice during this session at Oxford. The conventicle act having been passed in 1664, the high church party now secured a further triumph of bigotry over religious liberty by the passing of the five mile act, and only a majority of six prevented the adoption of another bill extending its monstrous provisions to all dissenting laymen as well as to all dissenting clergymen.

If, however, the brief Oxford session of parliament transacted business that must have helped to excite in Locke greater interest in political affairs than may have resulted from the distant and hardly reported proceedings in London, he probably saw the court in a much more favourable aspect than it generally presented in the metropolis. The Dutch war increased the work that had to be done by courtiers as well as by other folk; and the plague had thrown such gloom over the whole country, that even courtiers were not in the mood to play.

But Locke, hitherto for so long a time an almost constant resident at Oxford, only remained in it during the first five or six weeks of the royal stay in the town. The money voted, in October, 1665, towards the continuance of the war with Holland, was, of course, mainly required for the fitting out of new ships, and the renewing of munitions of all sorts in anticipation of fresh hostilities in the spring; but a portion of it was spent in diplomacy, and one of several small efforts to increase the strength of England by indirect means was an embassy to the elector of Brandenburg, whose territory was in immediate proximity to Holland, and whom it was

therefore desirable to keep neutral if he could not be secured as an active ally. This embassy was entrusted to Sir Walter Vane, and Locke was appointed to act as his secretary.

How the appointment came to be made is not recorded. But we need have no hesitation in assuming that it was effected either through the direct influence of William Godolphin or through Godolphin's introduction of Locke to Arlington and other leading men at court, perhaps to Charles the Second himself. As regards Locke, we can readily understand how willingly he accepted an offer enabling him, after so many years of studious retirement, to try his hand at public business, or, if the change of work was no attraction to him, to welcome the prospect which it afforded of a first visit to the continent. He evidently had not any thought, at this time, of abandoning his old pursuits. He probably considered that he would be able to resume those pursuits with new zest after a few months' occupation in other ways, and with the stock of fresh health and experience that it might be expected to bring him.

Sir Walter Vane was the fifth son of Sir Henry Vane the elder, who had been secretary of state to Charles the First, and was thus a younger brother of the Sir Henry Vane who was executed in 1662. He was a royalist, however, and during most, if not all, of the Commonwealth period he resided abroad. He was in Holland between 1654 and 1656, and often afterwards, and, having returned from one of these visits just before the new war was declared in the spring of 1665, his experience was found useful at court.¹ He was doubtless as serviceable a man as could be chosen for the work now assigned to him.

¹ *Domestic State Papers, Reign of Charles the Second*, vol. cxvii., no. 18.

About that work and its execution abundant information exists, as there has come down to us—besides the originals of twenty-six letters, chiefly in Locke's handwriting, but signed by Vane, to Lord Arlington and Joseph Williamson¹—a letter book in which Locke had carefully copied several of these letters and several others addressed to Lord Clarendon, Sir William Morrice, and Sir William Coventry, along with all the replies to Vane's letters, forty in all, that were received from those various correspondents.² But these letters are not of much interest to us. As to the public business to which they refer, it will be sufficient here to say that Vane, having been sent out to invite the friendly neutrality of Brandenburg, and to recommend neutrality as being to the advantage of the elector, no less than to that of the English king, received for answer that the elector was willing enough to remain neutral—or to be a fighting ally, for the matter of that, if King Charles would pay him well for it—but that he was not in the habit of showing friendship without a money return; and that, though Vane himself approved of the course hinted at, and urged the English government to bribe the Brandenburgers, his suggestion was not agreed to, and he was forced to return with nothing done, after remaining just two months in Cleve, and, perhaps, spending more than the 300*l.* that was allowed to him for the work.³

One point is noteworthy in this correspondence. We find Vane writing for instructions indiscriminately to Lord Clarendon, Lord Arlington, and their subordinates, once,

¹ *Foreign State Papers, German States*, series i., nos. 128—155.

² *Additional MSS.*, no. 16272, in the British Museum.

³ *Domestic State Papers, Reign of Charles the Second*, vol. cxlvi., no. 81.

in desperation, to King Charles himself, and in the same way receiving instructions indiscriminately from Arlington, Clarendon, and their subordinates. In a small matter like this there was not room for much confusion; but it is easy to see what risks, in weightier business, would be incurred from such a redundance of masters, especially when the masters were jealous of one another, and when, as was often the case, the lord chancellor had to dictate his letters from the bed to which he was confined by the gout, and the secretary of state's letters were scribbled off in the ante-chamber of one or other of his own or his sovereign's mistresses.

The public import of this embassy, however, does not much concern us. The interest lies, not in Locke's first and last experiment in diplomatic service, but in his personal experiences during a winter visit to a quaint old town in the western valley of the Rhine, and to one of the most antiquated and pettifogging of German courts.¹

¹ Le Clerc says in his 'Eloge,' that "in 1664 Locke left England, and went to Germany as secretary to Sir William Swann, who was envoy of the king of England to the elector of Brandenburg, and some other German princes." Le Clerc mistook the year, and confounded Swann with Vane. Sir William Swann was envoy to the Hanse Towns, and resident at Hamburg, between 1662 and 1673, and a friend has called my attention to a letter signed by Swann, but written by a secretary whose handwriting is somewhat like Locke's, dated March 22nd, 1664, among the *Hamburg State Papers* in the Record Office. The same handwriting, however, appears in several other letters of this series; the first dated November 3rd, 1663; when, as we have seen, Locke was certainly at Oxford. The handwriting, moreover, though superficially like Locke's, contains characteristic differences from his. Lord King correctly states that Locke went as secretary to Sir Walter Vane, instead of Sir William Swann; but he follows Le Clerc in giving the wrong year.

Leaving Oxford early in November, 1665, and perhaps spending a few days in London, Locke, in attendance on Sir Walter Vane, proceeded, through Ostend, Ghent, and Antwerp, to Brussels, where they arrived on the 24th of the month.¹ There business detained them for a day or two, and they reached their destination, Cleve, the capital of Brandenburg, on the 30th.²

“We are here,” Locke wrote to Boyle on the 12th of December, “in a place very little considerable for anything but its antiquity, which to me seems neither to commend things nor opinions; and I should scarce prefer an old ruinous and incommodious house to a new and more convenient, though Julius Cæsar built it, as they say he did this the elector dwells in; which opinion the situation, just on the edge of a precipice, and the oldness of the building, seem to favour. The town is little, and not very strong or handsome; the buildings and streets irregular. Nor is there a greater uniformity in their religion, three professions being publicly allowed. The Calvinists are more than the Lutherans, and the catholics more than both—but no papist bears any office—besides some anabaptists, who are not publicly tolerated. But yet this distance in their churches gets not into their houses. They quietly permit one another to choose their way to heaven; for I cannot observe any quarrels or animosities amongst them upon the account of religion.

¹ *Foreign State Papers, German States*, series i., nos. 128, 139; Vane to Arlington, 23 Nov., 4 Dec., and 21-31 Dec., 1665.

² *Ibid.*, no. 182; Vane to Arlington (not dated). Some of the letters in this correspondence are dated according to the old (English), some according to the new (continental) style, a difference of ten days, thus causing a little confusion; but I believe the dates given in the text correctly follow the English rule.

This good correspondence is owing partly to the power of the magistrate, and partly to the prudence and good nature of the people, who, as I find by inquiry, entertain different opinions without any secret hatred or rancour.”¹

The “good nature of the people” seems to have shown itself especially in a love of eating and drinking; and in his amusing descriptions of the feasts at which he was present, Locke appears in a humour new to us. In his first official letters home, Sir Walter Vane complained that he could get no business done for the festivities to which he was expected to devote himself; and to John Strachey, of Sutton, near Bristol, an old family acquaintance, and his junior by two years, of whom we shall see more hereafter, Locke sent long accounts of these festivities, both at court and elsewhere.

“This day,” he wrote on or about the 9th of December, “our public entertainment upon the elector’s account ended, much to my satisfaction; for I had no great pleasure in a feast where, amidst a great deal of meat and company, I had little to eat and less to say. The advantage was, the lusty Germans fed so heartily themselves, that they regarded not much my idleness; and I might have enjoyed a perfect quiet, and slept out the meal, had not a glass of wine now and then jogged me. And therein lay the care of their entertainment, and the sincerity too, for the wine was such as might be known, and was not ashamed of itself: but, for their meats, they were all so disguised that I should have guessed they had rather designed a mess than a meal, and had a mind rather to pose than feed us. The cook made their metamorphoses like Ovid’s, where the change is usually

¹ Boyle, ‘Works’ (1744), vol. v., p. 565; Locke to Boyle, 12 Dec., 1665.

into the worse. I had, however, courage to venture upon things unknown, and I could not often tell whether I ate flesh, or fish, or good red herring, so much did they dissemble themselves: only, now and then a dish of good honest fresh-water fish came in, so free from all manner of deceit or cheat as they hid not so much as their tails in a drop of butter, nor was there any sauce near to disguise them. What think you of a hen and cabbage? or a piece of powdered beef covered over with preserved quinces? These are no miracles here. One thing there is that I like very well, which is, that they have good salads all the year, and use them frequently. It is true, the elector gave his victuals, but the officers that attended us valued their services, and one of them had ready in his pocket a list of those that expected rewards, at such a rate that the attendance cost more than the meat was worth.”¹

“I had formerly seen the size and arms of the duke’s guards,” Locke wrote on the 11th of December to the same friend, whom he seems to have furnished with a regular journal of his proceedings, though all his letters have not been preserved, “but to-day I had a sample of their stomachs—I mean, to eat, not to fight; for, if they be able to do as much that way too, no question but under their guard the duke is as much in safety as I believe his victuals are in danger. But to make you the better understand my story, and the decorum which made me take notice of it, I must first describe the place to you. The place where the elector commonly eats is a large room, into which you enter at the lower end by an ascent of some few steps. Just without this is a lobby. As this evening I was passing through it into the court, I saw a

¹ Lord King; Locke to Strachey, 9, 10, and 11 Dec.; 1665.

company of soldiers very close together, and a steam rising from the midst of them. I, as strangers use to be, being a little curious, drew near to these men of mettle, where I found three or four earthen fortifications, wherein were intrenched peas-porridge and stewed turnips or apples, most valiantly stormed by these men of war. They stood just opposite to the duke's table, and within view of it; and had the duke been there at supper, as it was very near his supper time, I should have thought they had been set there to provoke his appetite by example, and serve, as cocks have done in some countries before battle, to fight the soldiers into courage; and certainly these soldiers might eat others into stomachs. Here you might have seen the court and camp drawn near together; there a supper preparing with great ceremony, and just by it a hearty meal made without stool, trencher, table-cloth, or napkins, and for aught I could see, without beer, bread, or salt. But I stayed not long; for methought it was a dangerous place, and so I left them in the engagement."¹

We can follow Locke to yet another representative meal. "I was invited and dined at a monastery," he wrote on the 9th of December, "with the Franciscan friars, who had before brought a Latin epistle to us for relief; for they live upon others' charity, or, more truly, live idly upon others' labours. But to my dinner; for my mouth waters to be at it, and no doubt you will long for such another entertainment when you know this. After something instead of grace or music—choose you whether, for I could make neither of it; for, though what was sung was Latin, yet the tune was such that I neither understood the Latin nor the harmony; the beginning of the Lord's Prayer, to the first petition, they repeated aloud,

¹ Lord King; Locke to Strachey, 9, 10, and 11 Dec., 1665.

but went on silently to 'Sed libera nos,' etc, and then broke out into a loud chorus, which continued to the end; during their silence they stooped forwards, and held their heads as if they had been listening to one another's whispers. After this prelude, down we sat: the chief of the monks (I suppose the prior) in the inside of the table, just in the middle, and all his brethren on each side of him. I was placed just opposite to him, as if I had designed to bid battle to them all. But we were all very quiet; and, after some silence, in marched a solemn procession of peas-porridge, every one his dish. I could not tell by the looks what it was, till, putting my spoon in for discovery, some few peas in the bottom peeped out. I had pity on them, and was willing enough to spare them, but was forced by good manners, though against my nature and appetite, to destroy some of them, and so on I fell. All this while not a word. I could not tell whether to impute the silence to the eagerness of their stomachs, which allowed their mouths no other employment but to fill them, or any other reason. I was confident it was not in admiration of their late music. At last the oracle of the place spoke, and told them he gave them leave to speak to entertain me. I returned my compliment; and then to discourse we went, helter-skelter, as hard as our bad Latin and worse pronounciation, on each side, would let us; but no matter—we cared not for Priscian, whose head suffered that day not a little. However, this saved me from the peas-pottage and the peas-pottage from me, for now I had something else to do. Our next course was, every one his act of fish, and butter to boot; but whether it was intended for fresh or salt fish I cannot tell, and I believe it is a question as hard as any Thomas ever disputed. Our third service was cheese and butter, and

the cheese had this peculiar in it, which I never saw anywhere else, that it had caraway seeds in it. The prior had upon the table by him a little bell, which he rang when he wanted anything; and those that waited never brought him anything, or took it away, but they bowed with much reverence and kissed the table. The prior was a good plump fellow, that had more belly than brains, and methought was very fit to be revered, and not much unlike some head of a college. I liked him well for an entertainment; for, if we had had a good dinner, he would not have disturbed me much with his discourse. The first that kissed the table did it so leisurely that I thought he had held his head there that the prior, during our silence, might have wrote something on his bald crown, and made it sink that way into his understanding. Their beer was pretty good, but their countenances bespoke better; their bread brown, and their table-linen neat enough. After dinner we had the second part of the same tune, and after that I departed. The truth is, they were very civil and courteous, and seemed good-natured. It was their time of fast in order to Christmas. If I have another feast there, you shall be my guest. You will perhaps have reason to think that, whatever becomes of the rest, I shall bring home my belly well improved, since all I tell you is of eating and drinking. But you must know that knight-errants do not choose their adventures, and those who sometimes live pleasantly in brave castles, amidst feasting and ladies, are at other times in battles and wildernesses, and you must take them as they come."¹

The wit and wisdom with which Locke freely sprinkled his humorous descriptions of the strange scenes and new

¹ Lord King, p. 21; Locke to Strachey, 9, 10 and 11 Dec., 1665.

phases of character with which he now made acquaintance, hardly need to be pointed out.

Having dined on the Saturday after his arrival in Cleve with the elector of Brandenburg, whose more ancient and, in that city, more special title was duke of Cleve, and having on the following Wednesday been entertained, as we have seen, by the Franciscan friars, whom, with pardonable carelessness, he sometimes called monks, he went on Thursday to service in the Lutheran church. Here, and in similar society, of course, his ignorance of German placed him at a disadvantage that he was free from when in the company of the friars and others who used Latin in their ordinary discourse as well as in religious ceremonies. "I found them all merrily singing with their hats on," he wrote, "so that, by the posture they were in, and the fashion of the building, not altogether unlike a theatre, I was ready to fear that I had mistook the place. I thought they had met only to exercise their voices; for, after a long stay, they still continued on their melody, and I verily believe they sang the 119th Psalm—nothing else could be so long. But what made it a little tolerable was that they sing better than we do in our churches, and are assisted by an organ. The music being done, up went the preacher and prayed; and then they sang again; and then, after a little prayer, at which they all stood up (and, as I understand since, was the Lord's Prayer), he read some of the Bible, and then, laying by his book, preached to them, *memoriter*. His sermon, I think, was in blank verse; for by the modulation of his voice, which was not very pleasant, his periods seemed to be all nearly the same length. But, if his matter were no better than his delivery, those that slept had no great loss, and might have snored as harmoniously. After

sermon, a prayer, and the organ and voice again ; and, to conclude all, up stood another minister at a little desk, above the communion table (for in Lutheran and Calvinist churches here there are no chancels), gave the benediction, which I was told was the 'Ite, in nomine Domini,' crossed himself, and so dismissed them. In the church I observed two pictures, one a crucifix, the other I could not well discern ; but in the Calvinist church, no picture at all."¹

A fortnight after Locke went again to the Lutheran church. "After a good, lusty, rattling High Dutch sermon, the sound whereof would have made one think it had the design of reproof," he said, "I had an opportunity to observe the administration of the sacrament, which was thus : The sermon being ended, the minister that preached not (for they have two to a church) stood up at a little desk which was upon the communion table, almost at the upper end of the church, and then read a little while ; part of which reading I judged to be prayer, but observed no action that looked like consecration ; I know not what the words were. When he had done, he placed himself at the north end of the table, and the other minister, that preached, at the south end, so that their backs were towards one another. Then there marched up to him on the north side a communicant, who, when he came to the minister, made a low bow and knelt down, and then the minister put the wafer into his mouth ; which done, he rose, made his obeisance, and went to the other end, where he did the same, and had the wine poured into his mouth, without taking the cup in his hand, and then came back to his place by the south side of the church. Thus did four, one after another,

¹ Lord King, p. 23 ; Locke to Strachey, 9, 10, and 11 Dec., 1665.

which were all received that day, and amongst them was a boy about thirteen or fourteen years old.”¹

Locke described his visits to the Calvinist churches, but there was nothing very noteworthy in them. The Calvinists, he said, “differ very little from our English presbyterians.” With one of them, however, he had an encounter. “I met lately, accidentally,” he told his friend, “with a young sucking divine, that thought himself no small champion; who, as if he had been some knight-errant, bound by oath to bid battle to all comers, first accosted me in courteous voice; but, the customary salute being over, I found myself assaulted most furiously, and heavy loads of arguments fell upon me. I, that expected no such thing, was fain to guard myself under the trusty broad shield of ignorance, and only now and then returned a blow by way of inquiry, and, by this Parthian way of flying, defended myself till passion and want of breath had made him weary, and so we came to an accommodation; though, had he had lungs enough, and I no other use for my ears, the combat might have lasted (if that may be called a combat *ubi tu pulsas ego vapulo tantum*) as long as the wars of Troy, and the end of all had been like that, nothing but some rubbish of divinity as useless and incoherent as the ruins the Greeks left behind them. This was a probationer in theology, and I believe (to keep still to my errantry), they are bound to show their prowess with some valiant unknown, before they can be dubbed and receive the dignity of the order. I cannot imagine why else he should set upon me, a poor innocent wight, who thought nothing of a combat, and desired to be peaceable, and was too far from my own dunghill to be quarrelling. But it is no matter: there were no wounds

¹ Lord King, p. 17; Locke to Strachey, 15, 22, and 24 Dec., 1665.

made but in Priscian's head, who suffers much in this country. This provocation I have sufficiently revenged upon one of their church, our landlord, who is wont sometimes to Germanise and to be a little too much of the creature. These frailties I threaten him to discover to his pastor, who will be sure to rebuke him (but sparing his name) the next Sunday from the pulpit, and severely chastise the liberty of his cups. Thus I sew up the good man's mouth, because the other gaped too much, and make him as much bear my tongue as I was punished with the other's. But, for all this, he will sometimes drink himself into a defiance of divines and discipline, and hearken only to Bacchus's inspirations."¹

Locke was rather more severe upon the catholics than upon the protestants whom he met at Cleve; and, being there at Christmas-time, he had unusual opportunities for studying their tawdry piety. He recounted his experiences on the 15th of December, which, owing to the difference of reckoning in England and on the continent, was the 25th at Cleve. "Christmas Day, about one in the morning," he said, "I went a-gossiping to Our Lady—think me not profane, for the name is a great deal modester than the service I was at. I shall not describe all the particulars I observed in that church, being the principal of the catholics' in Cleve, but only those that were particular to the occasion. Near the high altar was a little altar for this day's solemnity. The scene was a stable; wherein was an ox, an ass, a cradle, the Virgin, the Babe, Joseph, shepherds, and angels, *dramatis personæ*. Had they but given them motion, it had been a perfect puppet-play, and might have deserved pence a-piece; for they were of the same size and make that

¹ Lord King, p. 17; Locke to Strachey, 15, 22, and 24 Dec., 1665.

our English puppets are, and I am confident these shepherds and this Joseph are akin to that Judith and Holofernes which I have seen at Bartholomew fair. A little without the stable was a flock of sheep cut out of cards; and these, as they there stood without their shepherds, appeared to me the best emblem I had seen a long time, and, methought, resembled these poor innocent people, who, whilst their shepherds pretend so much to follow Christ and pay their devotion to Him, are left unregarded in the barren wilderness. This was the show. The music to it was all vocal in the choir adjoining; but such as I never heard. They had strong voices, but so ill-tuned, so ill-managed, that it was their misfortune, as well as ours, that they could be heard. He that could not, though he had a cold, make better music with a chevy-chase over a pot of smooth ale, deserved well to pay the reckoning and go away athirst. However, I think they were the honestest singing men I have ever seen; for they endeavoured to deserve their money, and earned it certainly with pains enough; for what they wanted in skill they made up with loudness and variety. Every one had his own tune, and the result of all was like the noise of choosing parliament-men, where every one endeavours to cry the loudest. Besides the men, there was a company of little choristers. I thought, when I saw them at first, they had danced to the others' music, and that it had been your Gray's Inn revels, for they were jumping up and down about a good charcoal fire that was in the middle of the choir (this, their devotion, and their singing, was enough, I think, to keep them warm, though it were a very cold night); but it was not dancing, but singing, they served for. When it came to their turns, away they ran to their places, and there they made as

good harmony as a concert of little pigs would ; and they were much about as cleanly. Their part being done, out they sallied again to the fire, where they played till their cue called them, and then back to their places they huddled. So negligent and slight are they in their service, in a place where the nearness of adversaries might teach them to be more careful. But I suppose the natural tendency of their outside performances and their mummeries in religion would bring it everywhere to this pass, did not fear and the severity of the magistrates preserve it ; which being taken away here, they very easily suffer themselves to slobber over their ceremonies, which in other places are kept up with so much zeal and exactness. But methinks they are not to be blamed, since the one seems to me as much religion as the other.”¹

“In the afternoon,” Locke continued, “I went to the Carthusians’ church. They had their little gentry too, but in finer clothes, and their angels with surplices on, and singing books in their hands ; for here is nothing to be done without books. Hither were crowded a great throng of children to see these pretty babies—and I amongst them, as wise and devout as they, and for my pains had a good sprinkle of holy water, and now I may defy the devil. That which pleased me most was, that at the same catholic church, the next day, I saw Our Lady, all in white linen, dressed as one that was newly lain in, and on her lap something that, perhaps twenty years since, was designed for a baby, but now it has grown to have a beard, and, methought, was not so well used as our country-fellows used to be, who, though they escape all the year, are usually trimmed at Christ-

¹ Lord King, p. 13 ; Locke to Strachey, 15, 22, 24 Dec., 1665.

mas. They must pardon me for being merry, for it is Christmas. But, to be serious with you, the catholic religion is a different thing from what we believe it in England. I have other thoughts of it than when I was in a place that is filled with prejudices, and things are known only by hearsay. I have not met with any so good-natured people, or so civil, as the catholic priests, and I have received many courtesies from them, which I shall always gratefully acknowledge.”¹

In at any rate one respect, however, Locke found the society of these priests, or the more learned of them, and of the Franciscan friars to whom we have already been introduced, irksome to him. “When I left Oxford,” he wrote to his friend, “I thought for a while to take leave of all university affairs; but, do what I can, I am still kept in that track.”² Besides the divinity disputation with the young Calvinist of which his account has been quoted, he gave an amusing description of an interview with an old Latin verse writer, who insisted upon reading and praising his own compositions. “I had almost rather have been soused in the Rhine, as frozen as it was; for it could not have been more cold and intolerable than the poetry I met with.” But yet worse were the metaphysical discussions with which he was entertained by the Franciscan “monks.” “Poor *materia prima* was canvassed cruelly, stripped of all the gay dress of her forms, and shown naked to us; though, I must confess, I had not eyes good enough to see her.” “The young monks (which one would not guess by their looks) are subtle people, and dispute as eagerly for *materia prima*, as if they were to make their dinner on

¹ Lord King, p. 15; Locke to Strachey, 15, 22, 24 Dec., 1665.

² *Ibid.*

it; and, perhaps, sometimes it is all their meal, for which others' charity is more to be blamed than their stomachs." Locke referred to one discussion in particular: "The professor of philosophy and moderator of the disputation was more acute at it than Father Hudibras. He was top-full of distinctions, which he produced with so much gravity, and applied with so good a grace, that ignorant I began to admire logic again, and could not have thought that 'simpliciter et secundum quid materialiter et formaliter' had been such gallant things; which, with the right stroking of his whiskers, the settling of his hood, and his stately walk, made him seem to himself and me something more than Aristotle and Democritus. But he was so hotly charged by one of the seniors of the fraternity, that I was afraid sometimes what it would produce, and feared there would be no other way to decide the controversy between them but by cuffs; but a subtle distinction divided the matter between them, and so they parted good friends. The truth is, here hog-shearing is much in its glory, and our disputing in Oxford comes as far short of it as the rhetoric of Carfax does that of Billingsgate. But it behoves the monks to cherish this art of wrangling in its declining age, which they first nursed and sent abroad into the world to give it a troublesome, idle employment."¹

Besides his healthy mockery of the courtiers, priests, and such-like, Locke found occasion to make fun of the ways of other folk in Cleve. "You must not expect anything remarkable from me all the following week," he wrote in sequel to his account of the "mummeries in religion" and "slobbered-over ceremonies" of Christmas time, "for I have spent it in getting a pair of gloves, and

¹ Lord King, p. 20; Locke to Strachey, 15, 22, 24 Dec., 1665.

think too, I have had quick despatch. You will perhaps wonder at it, and think I talk like a traveller; but I will give you the particulars of the business. Three days were spent in finding out a glover; for, though I can walk all the town over in less than an hour, yet their shops are so contrived as if they were designed to conceal, not expose, their wares; and, though you may think it strange, yet methinks it is very well done, and it is a becoming modesty to conceal that which they have reason enough to be ashamed of. But to proceed. The next two days were spent in drawing them on; the right hand (or, as they call them here, hand-shoe), Thursday, and the left hand, Friday; and I'll promise you this was two good days' work, and little enough to bring them to fit my hands, and to consent to be fellows, which, after all, they are so far from, that when they are on I am always afraid my hands should go to cuffs one with another, they so disagree. Saturday, we concluded the price, computed and changed our money; for it requires a great deal of arithmetic and a great deal of brass to pay twenty-eight stivers and seven doights; but, God be thanked, they are all well fitted with counters for reckoning, for their money is good for nothing else, and I am poor here with my pockets full of it. I wondered at first why the market people brought their wares in little carts drawn by one horse, till I found it necessary to carry home the price of them; for a horse-load of turnips would be two horse-load of money. A pair of shoes cannot be got under half a year: I lately saw the cow killed out of whose hide I hope to have my next pair. The first thing after they are married here is to bespeak the child's coat, and truly the bridegroom must be a bungler that gets not the child before the mantle be made; for it is far easier

here to have a man made than a suit. To be serious with you, they are the slowest people, and fullest of delays, that ever I have met with, and their money as bad."¹

After all this, and premising that he did not regard skill in logic-chopping and in theological or metaphysical disputation as in themselves necessary proofs of learning, it is not strange to find Locke saying to Boyle, in the letter from which an extract has already been made, "I have not yet heard of any person here eminently learned." "There is one, Dr. Scardius," he added, "who, I am told, is not altogether a stranger to chemistry. I intend to visit him as soon as I can get a handsome opportunity. The rest of their physicians go the old road, I am told and easily guess by their apothecaries' shops, which are unacquainted with chemical remedies. This, I suppose, makes this town so ill-furnished with books of that kind, there being few here curious enough to inquire after chemistry or experimental learning. And, as I once heard you say, I find it true here, as well as in other places, that the great cry is ends of gold and silver."²

Boyle, always anxious to collect information of every sort on every topic through every channel from every part of the world, both for his own enlightenment and for the enlightenment of the Royal Society and its Oxford branch, appears to have asked Locke to send him any news he could obtain while on the continent. Locke forwarded a list of thirteen new books on medical and kindred topics which he had met with; also a short account of some "petrifying" water. "I met with a Jesuit who had been in Hungary. I inquired whether

¹ Lord King, p. 16; Locke to Strachey, 15, 22, and 24 Dec., 1665.

² Boyle, 'Works,' vol. v., p. 565; Locke to Boyle, 12 Dec., 1665.

he had seen the mines. He told me that he had gone down into a copper-mine near Neisol (if I mistake not the name), six hundred fathoms deep; that at the bottom, in a hollow of some bigness, there dropped down water which they received in a wooden trough, wherein they cast pieces of old iron, which by the water would be turned into good copper; that a piece of iron of the bigness of a man's finger would be changed in three months, and the mutation began from the superficies inwards with streaks, or, to use his word, striatum; that he had a horseshoe, whose exterior part was copper, and inside iron."¹ We shall see hereafter that Boyle had a vague, unscientific belief in the possibility of transmuting inferior into superior metals, which he was anxious that both Locke and Newton should help him to verify.

Several letters that Locke is known to have written from Cleve to his friends in England have unfortunately been lost. One that he sent to Dr. Pococke, the Oxford professor, early in January,² doubtless contained matter that would have been very interesting to us. Of a series of letters that he addressed to William Godolphin, moreover, only one is extant; but their loss is less to be regretted, as, from the tenour of the one we have, it would appear that they substantially agreed with the official letters that he wrote on behalf of Sir Walter Vane to Arlington, Clarendon, and their secretaries.

Of these official letters it is enough to say here that they abundantly correct any suspicion that might arise in our minds as to Locke's attention to business. The business chiefly consisted in attendance at court, along with

¹ Boyle, 'Works,' vol. v., p. 565; Locke to Boyle, 12, Dec., 1665.

² *Foreign State Papers, German States*, series i., no. 148**; Locke to Williamson, 16—26 Jan., 1665-6.

Vane, in receiving visits from the elector's agents and others, and in maintaining a correspondence with the authorities at home; but such duties as these evidently engrossed a good deal of time, and those occupations of Locke's which are most interesting to us filled up only his leisure hours.

A few sentences from the only extant letter written to Godolphin—the document, indeed, being only Locke's copy or draft of it—will suffice us as illustrations of his concernments and opinions as a “secretary of legation.” “I have hitherto,” he wrote, on the 29th of December, concerning the elector and his advisers, “been of the mind that their councils here tend to the preserving a neutrality, and the reasons I had to think so were that I saw no preparations for war, no levies made, but only talked of; and besides, I was informed that there is a great scarcity of money, that the expenses of the court are great, the debts greater, and the revenue small. Perhaps, since money seems to me to be here, as in other places, the great sorder of pacts and agreements, they delay the bargain to raise the price, and wait for the best chapman. They treat with Holland; they treat with France; and in what terms they stand with us, you will see by Sir Walter.”¹ While Sir Walter Vane was urging that the elector should be bribed to neutrality, Locke seems to have been of opinion that no bribe was needed to keep the elector neutral, though he would have been glad of some English money to spend, or pretend to spend, in military operations against Holland, in his own interests rather than in those of his ally. If that was Locke's view, events proved that it was a sound one.

¹ Lord King, p. 12; Locke to “Mr. G.,” [29] Dec., 1665.

How Locke was occupied, apart from diplomatic work, during January, 1665-6, we are not told. The only extant letter written by him in that month is a short one addressed to Joseph Williamson, implying that he had not received any letters from his friends at home since his departure, and that he was much disappointed thereat. Some arrangement had been made with Godolphin for the transmission by him of Locke's letters along with the official dispatches;¹ but, perhaps through no fault of Godolphin's, none were thus transmitted, at any rate up to the 16th of January, when Locke wrote to Williamson. "The knowledge I have of your civility," he there said, "makes me confidently desire you that, if any letters from any of my friends in England to me come to your hands, you would do me the favour to send them me in the packet to Sir Walter. All other ways of conveyance hither are so utterly unknown to me, and give me so little hopes of receiving any letters, that you will pardon this request to a man that is unwilling to be deprived of the correspondence of all those friends, and the knowledge of some affairs, he left in England, and who hopes the granting of it will not cost you much trouble."²

Locke had not to wait very much longer, however, to know how his friends and affairs were going on in England. With Sir Walter Vane he left, or at any rate it was arranged that he should leave, the capital of Brandenburg, on the 8th of February,³ and he was in London again some few days before the 22nd of the same month.⁴

¹ Boyle, 'Works,' vol. v., p. 565; Locke to Boyle, 12 Dec., 1665.

² *Foreign State Papers, German States*, series i., no. 148 **; Locke to Williamson, 16—26 Jan., 1665-6.

³ *Ibid.*, series i., no. 155; Vane to Arlington, 6—16 Feb., 1665-6.

⁴ Lord King, p. 25; Locke to Strachey, 22 Feb., 1665-6.

Locke was found to have performed so well his duties as secretary to Sir Walter Vane, that immediately after his return to London—where he met the court, which had just returned from Oxford—proposals for more important diplomatic work were made to him. “I am now offered a fair opportunity of going into Spain with the ambassador,” he wrote to his friend John Strachey.¹

The new ambassador to Spain was Edward Montagu, Earl of Sandwich, chiefly memorable as a naval commander—he was killed while showing some desperate valour at the battle of Solebay, in May, 1672—but a useful statesman, as statesmen went in those days. France, in formal alliance with Holland, having just declared war against England, it was deemed very important to secure, if possible, the support of Spain. Accordingly, Sandwich was hastily appointed to supersede Sir Richard Fanshaw at Madrid, and William Godolphin was selected to accompany him as “assistant,” in some position superior to that of a secretary.² It was doubtless as secretary, and at Godolphin’s instigation, that Locke was invited to join the embassy. It was indeed a “fair opportunity” of stepping forward in diplomatic life, certain, in the case of a man of ability, and not too scrupulous, to lead to very high employment in the public service.

Locke so regarded it. “If I embrace it,” he said, “I shall conclude this my wandering year. If I go, I shall not have above ten days’ stay in England. I am pulled both ways by divers considerations, and do yet waver. I intend to-morrow for Oxford, and shall there take my resolution.” He did so, and posterity may be grateful to

¹ Lord King, p. 25; Locke to Strachey, 22 Feb., 1665-6.

² *Domestic State Papers, Reign of Charles II.*, vol. cxlix., no. 81.

him for his decision. "Those fair offers I had to go to Spain," he wrote to Strachey from Oxford a week later, "have not prevailed with me. Whether I have let slip the minute that they say every one has once in his life to make himself, I cannot tell. This I am sure, I never trouble myself for the loss of that which I never had."¹ The ship containing the Earl of Sandwich, William Godolphin, and their suite, weighed anchor on the 3rd of March.²

Having chosen to stay in England, Locke appears to have decided to resume his old ways of life at Oxford; but before settling down again he paid a visit, both of business and of pleasure, to Somersetshire.

"I sent my uncle a letter of attorney before I left England," he had written from Cleve to Strachey early in the previous December, "to authorise him to dispose of my affairs there, and settle my estate as he shall think most convenient. I hope he received it. I think it best my tenants should not know that I am out of England, for perhaps that may make them the more slack to pay their rents."³ The uncle here referred to was doubtless Peter King, one of old John Locke's executors, who continued to assist in looking after his nephew's property, which, as we have seen, was now worth about 70*l.* a year. It is evident, however, that Locke did not altogether leave the management of this property in other hands; and he now went down to see that affairs were in order, as well as to pay a visit to his kinsfolk and friends in Somersetshire, and especially, it would seem, to Strachey.

Of Strachey we know very little, save that at this time

¹ Lord King, p. 25; Locke to Strachey, 28 Feb., 1665-6.

² *Domestic State Papers, Reign of Charles II.*, vol. cl., no. 25.

³ Lord King, p. 24; Locke to Strachey, 9, 10, 11 Dec., 1665.

he was one of Locke's most intimate acquaintances. Born in 1634, he was Locke's junior by two years, and—as he inherited from his mother, the widow of Samuel Baber, who had married one of the Stracheys of Saffron Walden, a goodly estate and a fine old manor house known as Sutton Court, and only about three miles from Pensford—they were doubtless friends from childhood, perhaps also college companions. As Strachey read law at Gray's Inn, he probably had before that a university education; but, whatever his training, he appears, before he was thirty or thirty-one, to have settled down for the short remainder of his life—he died in 1674—as a country gentleman. “Throw by this,” Locke said in a post-script to the letter that has just been quoted from, “in some corner of your study till I come, and then we will laugh together, for it may serve to recall other things to my memory.” “What private observations I have made,” he wrote again as soon as he had returned to London, “will be fitter for our table at Sutton than a letter; and if I have the opportunity to see you shortly, we may possibly laugh together at some German stories.”¹ In the letter which he sent six days later from Oxford, he congratulated himself that his resolution not to go to Spain would enable him to pay his visit to Sutton, “a greater rarity,” he added, “than my travels have afforded me; for, believe me, one may go a long way before one meets a friend.”²

Locke went to Somersetshire in March, and appears to have stayed there till near the end of April; but we have no information concerning either his holiday-making at Sutton Court, or his business occupations as landlord at Pensford and in the neighbourhood. All we know of his

¹ Lord King, p. 25; Locke to Strachey, 22 Feb., 1665-6.

² *Ibid.*, p. 26; Locke to Strachey, 28 Feb., 1665-6.

doings at this period is contained in a letter that he addressed to Robert Boyle after he had returned to Oxford.

Boyle, hearing of Locke's visit to the west of England, had sent him down a barometer, with which to make observations concerning the temperature in different parts, especially in the lead mines then and for some previous centuries worked in the Mendip Hills; and Locke wrote an entertaining and instructive report of his efforts to make the desired observations, and of other matters connected and disconnected therewith.

"As soon as the barometer came to my hands," he said, "I rode to Mendip with an intention to make use of it there in one of the deepest gruffs—for so they call their pits—I could find. The deepest I could hear of was about thirty fathoms, but the descent so far either from easy, safe, or perpendicular, that I was discouraged from entering on it. They do not, as in wells, sink their pits straight down, but as the crannies of the rocks give them the easiest passage: neither are they let down by a rope; but, taking the rope under their arm, by setting their hands and legs against the sides of the narrow passage, clamber up and down, which is not very easy for one not used to it, and almost impossible to carry down the barometer, both the hands being employed." By these obstacles Locke was deterred from pursuing his scientific observations; but he sent to Boyle—what is to us, if it was not to him, more interesting—some information about the people engaged in the mines.

He did not find these men or their ways very enlightened, though perhaps it was not strange that the barometer should have frightened them. "The sight of the engine," he said, "and my desire of going down into

some of their gruffs, gave them terrible apprehensions, and I could not persuade them but that I had some design; so that I and a gentleman that bore me company"—probably John Strachey—"had a pleasant scene, whilst their fear to be undermined by us made them disbelieve all we told them, and, do what we could, they would think us craftier fellows than we were. The women, too, were alarmed, and think us still either projectors or conjurors." "Since I could not get down into their gruffs," he went on to say, "I made it my business to inquire what I could concerning them. The workmen could give me very little account of anything but what profit made them seek after. They could apprehend no other mineral but lead ore, and believed the earth held nothing else worth seeking for. Besides, they were not forward to be too communicative to one they thought they had reason to be afraid of. But at my return, calling at a gentleman's house, who lives under Mendip Hills, amongst other things he told me this, that sometimes the damps catch them, and then, if they cannot get out soon enough, they fall into a swoon, and die in it; and, as soon as they have them above ground, they dig a hole in the earth, and then put in all but their faces, and cover them close up with turfs; and this is the surest remedy they have yet found to recover them. In deep pits they convey down air by the side of the gruff, in a little passage from the top; and that the air may circulate better, they set up some turfs on the inside of the hole, to catch, and so force down, the fresh air; but if these turfs be removed to the windy side, or laid close over the mouth of the hole, those below find it immediately by want of breath, indisposition, and fainting, and if they chance to have any sweet flowers with them, they

do not only lose their pleasant smell immediately, but stink as bad as carrion." "In their gruffs, after burning (when they meet with hard rocks in their way, they make a fire upon them, that they may dig through them the easier), they find it very dangerous to go down into them, as long as there remains any fire or heat in any chinks of the rocks."

Locke also reported to his friend the result of some experiments that he made with the barometer at the base, summit, and along the ascent of "a pretty steep high hill" near the house in which he abode, on the 3rd of April; which, however, showed little more than that the barometer was at fault through the presence of air in the tube. Further experiments, he said, were prevented by the return of the plague, which, at no other time so disastrous in its effects as in the summer and autumn of 1665, continued to do much mischief, and to cause great alarm in the ensuing years. "The spreading of the contagion made it less safe to venture abroad, and hastened me out of the country sooner than I intended."¹

Writing thus to Boyle from Christ Church early in May, 1666, Locke remained at Oxford, with the exception of two or three short absences, until the end of March, 1667.²

¹ Boyle, 'Works,' vol. v., p. 157; Locke to Boyle, 5 May, 1666. There is in this letter a paragraph indicative of Locke's modesty. Boyle seems to have asked for the barometrical experiments with a view to their being published in the *Philosophical Transactions* of the Royal Society. "I do not think anything in this letter fit for the public," Locke wrote; "but if, for want of better, this should be thought fit to fill an empty space in the philosophical newsbook, I shall desire to have my name concealed." No empty space was found for it.

² From this time valuable information as to Locke's whereabouts is incidentally furnished by 'A Register kept by Mr. Locke,' inserted in Boyle's

Whenever it was that Locke began to apply himself to a serious and systematic study of medicine, there can be no doubt that he had made great progress in it before his short trial in diplomatic work in the winter of 1665-6, and that, this work being over, he returned with new energy to his favourite pursuit. At the same time, it is clear that he had been studying, and continued to do so, in his own way, and not in accordance with university rules.

The Oxford requirements as regards medical education were so slight, that it is not easy to understand why he should have failed to comply with them. All that was expected from an applicant for a bachelorship in physic was regular attendance during three years at the lectures of the Arabic professor and of the professors of anatomy and medicine, together with participation in a certain number of disputations in the medical school, and after that little more than a delay of four years was necessary to qualify him for the doctorship. The medi-

'General History of the Air' (in vol. v. of his collected 'Works,') which Locke edited and prepared for publication in 1691. Locke took a great interest, all through his life, in scientific watching of the temperature and the changes of the seasons, and soon after his return to Oxford, in May, 1666, he began to keep a very careful record of the progress of the weather from day to day, which, with two important breaks, he steadily posted up, whenever he had the necessary appliances at hand, till the year 1683. Most of the entries are too technical to be of much general interest. Some, however, are of a different sort, and one is especially noteworthy as containing an account of the effect produced at Oxford by the great fire of London. Locke wrote thus, on the 3rd of September, 1666, in his Register: "Dim, reddish sunshine. This unusual colour of the air, which, without a cloud appearing, made the sunbeams of a strange red dim light, was very remarkable. We had then heard nothing of the fire of London; but it appeared afterwards to be the smoke of London then burning, which, driven this way by an easterly wind, caused this odd phenomenon."

cine lectures, delivered every Tuesday and Friday morning during term, were limited to an exposition of the teaching of Hippocrates and Galen. For anatomy, the students had in the spring to attend the dissecting of one human body and to hear four lectures, each two hours long, upon it, and in the autumn to hear three lectures on the human skeleton.¹ Dr. James Clayton was the professor of medicine till 1665; but, as his nerves were too delicate to allow of his presence at dissections, the anatomical teaching was neglected or done by proxy. His successor, Dr. James Hyde, was an eminent physician in his day; but his patients lived in London, so he also lectured only by proxy. The teaching provided in the schools was nearly as useless in the education of competent doctors as were Latin verse-writing and Aristotelian disputation in the education of useful politicians and sensible clergymen. We may be quite sure that Locke did not take to medicine in order that he might continue the obsolete doctrines of Hippocrates and Galen, excellent as their teachings had been in their own times, and revered as they must be by all their successors; yet it is strange that, paltry and inadequate as he may have considered them, he should not have complied with the formalities prescribed for claiming the diploma that would authorise him to make use of the knowledge acquired by him outside the university class-rooms.

That he failed to do that, however, is certain. On the 3rd of November, 1666, a year after the time when, in the ordinary course, he might have obtained the degree of doctor in physic, he procured from the Earl of Clarendon,

¹ 'Laudian Statutes,' title iv., section 1, caps. 15 and 16; title vi., section 5; also 'Tomlin's Ordinances;' both in Ward, 'Oxford University Statutes,' vol. i.

then chancellor of the university, a document of great significance. Addressing Dr. Fell, the vice-chancellor, and the several heads of houses, Clarendon thus wrote:—

“MR. VICE-CHANCELLOR AND GENTLEMEN,

“I am very well assured that Mr. John Locke, a master of arts and student of Christ Church, has employed his time in the study of physic to so good purpose that he is in all respects qualified for the degree of doctor in that faculty, for which he has also full time; but, having not taken the degree of bachelor in physic, he has desired that he may be dispensed with to accumulate that degree, which appears to me a very modest and reasonable request, he professing himself ready to perform the exercise for both degrees. I therefore very willingly give my consent that a dispensation to that purpose be propounded for him.

“Mr. Vice-Chancellor and Gentlemen,

“Your very affectionate servant,

“CLARENDON.”¹

That recommendation, almost equivalent to a command, was, strange to say, not attended to. Honorary degrees of all sorts were in these years given away in abundance at Oxford, and in this case the highest authority in the university vouched that the degree need only be an honorary one because certain formalities had been neglected: yet the chancellor's instruction was not heeded. It is evident that already adverse influences against Locke were at work. The high church party was dominant at Oxford; and Locke was not a high churchman.

Whatever else this instruction and its failure give us warrant for assuming, it shows conclusively that Locke had by this time resolved to devote himself to the medical profession, and felt that he needed nothing but a diploma to help him in entering upon it.

Eleven days later, doubtless on finding that Clarendon's

¹ *Shaftesbury Papers*, series viii., no. 8*.

request would be ignored by the university authorities, he obtained another document, and one that no university opposition could overrule. This did not directly assist him in the medical career that he had marked out for himself; but it enabled him to retain the Christ Church studentship, which he had lately been holding in an irregular way, and from which, now that he had finally abandoned all thought of becoming a clergyman, it is probable that some effort was being made to oust him. The document, marked in the margin, "Dispensation for Mr. Locke," and addressed "To our trusty, etc., the dean and chapter of Christ Church, in our university of Oxford," was as follows:—

"TRUSTY, ETC.,

"Whereas we are informed that John Locke, master of arts and student of Christ Church, in our university of Oxford, is of such standing as by the custom of that college he is obliged to enter into holy orders or otherwise to leave his student's place there, at his humble request that he may still have further time to prosecute his studies without that obligation, we are graciously pleased to grant him our royal dispensation, and do accordingly hereby require you to suffer him, the said John Locke, to hold and enjoy his said student's place in Christ Church, together with all the rights, profits, and emoluments thereunto belonging, without taking holy orders upon him according to the custom of the college or any rule of the students in that case, with which we are graciously pleased to dispense in that behalf. And for so doing this shall be your warrant. Given at our court at Whitehall, the 14th day of November, 1666, in the eighteenth year of our reign.

"By his majesty's command,

"WILLIAM MORRICE."¹

That dispensation, signed by Charles the Second's secretary of state, was of great advantage to Locke during

¹ *Shaftesbury Papers*, series viii., no. 22. This is the original document. An official copy of it is in the *Domestic Entry Book*, no. xiv., p. 103, in the Record Office.

the years in which it was allowed to have force. It was of immediate benefit in enabling him, instead of going out into the world in search of other occupation, to remain at the university, and to pursue his studies in medical and kindred subjects.

His old friend David Thomas was now practising as a doctor at Oxford, and Locke seems to have acted as his assistant, or perhaps even to have been a sort of junior partner with him.¹ They were at any rate working together in and after the early summer-time of 1666, and, from the fragments of correspondence that are extant, it is evident that, besides their strictly professional occupations, they were busily employed in chemical experiments and in the collection of drugs, partly at Boyle's instigation.

“According to the directions you gave in your last letter to Mr. Thomas,” Locke wrote to Boyle in February, 1666-7, “I have endeavoured to prepare paronychia, and I think I shall be able to procure pretty good store of it. The fittest time I suppose to gather it will be when it begins to be in flower, which will be about a fortnight hence, the spring hereabouts not being over forward.”² “Having from a passage in your writings taken the first notice of the time of gathering pœony roots, and since finding it in the observations communicated to Riverius, where the observer says it must be ‘*inclinante luna in Ariete existente*,’ which also F. Wurtz confirms with this addition, that it must be in April, when Sol is in Aries, and at plenilunium before the rising of the sun,” we read in another of Locke's letters to Boyle, “I rode to a place where was pretty good male pœony, and on the 14th

¹ Some evidence to this effect is adduced in the next section.

² Boyle, ‘Works,’ vol. v., p. 567; Locke to Boyle, 24 Feb., 1666-7.

instant, between ten and eleven in the morning, had some roots dug up, and am promised others to be dug up on the 30th instant before sunrising. If there be any advantage in the time of gathering, I owe the knowledge of it so much to you that I should be an unworthy reader of your writings, if I should not return you my thanks and offer you some part of these roots.”¹ In these and other letters from Locke to Boyle, and in later letters from Thomas to Locke, occur other passages referring to their drug collecting, as well as to their chemical experiments; but these are not now of much general interest, and the accounts given of some of their chemical experiments are rendered unintelligible to us by the use of special symbols to which no key exists. But the sentences already quoted will suffice to show with what zeal Locke was now devoting himself to at any rate some of the pursuits necessary to make him an efficient doctor.

The influence that was exerted upon Locke by Boyle, the boldest and most successful chemist of his day, must not be lost sight of. The acquaintance between the two men, which had begun long ago, seems by this time to have ripened into friendship, and the friendship lasted till Boyle's death in 1691.

Locke was now zealously preparing himself to be a competent doctor. But he was something more than an unfledged physician who had resisted all temptations to advance his own interests by becoming a clergyman, or to go into training for an ambassador. A stray letter that has come down to us furnishes much welcome illustration of his temper at this time. It was addressed from Christ Church to John Alford, a young gentleman of whom we only know that he was the son of Sir Edward Alford of

¹ Boyle, 'Works,' vol. v., p. 568; Locke to Boyle, 24 March, 1666-7.

Ossington Place, near Arundel, in Sussex, but whom we may assume to have been Locke's pupil while he was a student at Oxford. A more profitable letter of advice, more full of good counsel without pedantry, and of kindly interest without patronage, could not easily be written.

"SIR,—I have not yet quite parted with you, and though you have put off your gown, you are not yet got beyond my affection or concernment for you. 'Tis true you are now past masters and tutors, and it is now therefore that you ought to have the greater care of yourself, since those mistakes or miscarriages which heretofore would have been charged upon them will now, if any, light wholly upon you, and you yourself must be accountable for all your actions; nor will any longer any one else share in the praise or censure they may deserve. 'Twill be time, therefore, that you now begin to think yourself a man, and necessary that you take the courage of one. I mean not such a courage as may name you one of those daring gallants that stick at nothing, but a courage that may defend and secure your virtue and religion; for, in the world you are now looking into, you will find, perhaps, more onsets made upon your innocence than you can imagine; and there are more dangerous thieves than those that lay wait for your purse, who will endeavour to rob you of that virtue which they care not for themselves. I could wish you that happiness as never to fall into such company. But I consider you are to live in the world; and, whilst either the service of your country or your own business makes your conversation with men necessary, perhaps this caution will be needful. But you may withhold your heart where you cannot deny your company, and you may allow those your civility who possibly will not deserve your affection. I think it needless and impertinent to dissuade you from vices I never observed you inclined to. I write this to strengthen your resolutions, not to give you new ones. But let not the importunities or examples of others prevail against the dictates of your own reason and education. I do not in this advise you to be either a mumble or morose, to avoid company or not enjoy it. One may certainly with innocency use all the enjoyments of life, and I have been always of opinion that a virtuous life is best disposed to be the most pleasant, for certainly, amidst the troubles and vanities of this world, there are but two things that bring a real satisfaction with them, that is, virtue and knowledge. What progress you have made in the latter, you will do well not to lose. Your spare hours from devotion, business, or recreation (for that, too, I can allow where employment, not idleness, gives

a title to it) will be well bestowed in reviewing or improving your university notions, and if, at this distance, I could afford your studies any direction or assistance, I should be glad, and you need only let me know it. Though your ancestors have left you a condition above the ordinary rank, yet it's yourself alone that can advance yourself to it; for it's not either your going upon two legs, or living in a great house, or possessing many acres, that gives you advantage over beasts or other men, but the being wiser and better. I speak not this to make you careless of your estate; for, though riches be not virtue, it's a great instrument of it, wherein lies a great part of the usefulness and comfort of life. In the right management of this lies a great part of prudence; and about money is the great mistake of men, whilst they are either too covetous or too careless of it. If you throw it away idly, you lose your great support and best friend. If you hug it too closely, you lose it and yourself too. To be thought prudent and liberal, provident and good-natured, are things worth your endeavour to obtain, which perhaps you will better do by avoiding the occasions of expenses than by a frugal limiting them when occasion hath made them necessary. But I forget you are near your lady mother whilst I give you these advices, and do not observe that what I meant for a letter begins to grow into a treatise. Those many particulars that here is not room for I send you to seek in the writings of learned and sage authors. Let me give you by them those counsels I cannot now. They will direct you as well as I wish you, and I do truly wish you well. You will therefore pardon me for this once playing the tutor, since I shall hereafter always be, sir,

“Your faithful friend and servant,

“JOHN LOCKE.”¹

That letter stands almost by itself in the extant correspondence of Locke; but nearly every one of the letters written by him that we have sparkles with humour, not discordant, if different.

“Mr. Thomas presents his humble service to you,” Locke wrote to Boyle in February, 1666-7. “He and I are now upon a new sort of chemistry; that is, extracting money

¹ *Gentleman's Magazine*, vol. lxxvii. (1797), part i., p. 97; Locke to John Alford, 12 January, 1666-7. The letter was there said to be “in the possession of Mrs. Francis Bridger, of Fowlers, in Hawkhurst, a lineal descendant of John Alford.”

out of the scholars' pockets, and if we can do that, you need not fear but in time we shall have the lapis; for he that can get gold and silver out of scholars cannot doubt to extract it anywhere else. The truth is, he and I are preferred to be accessories of poll-money; and if you do not make haste hither, I believe you will, at your next coming, find us both beaten out of the town for having had too good thoughts of our neighbours, it being now an injury to believe any one rich or a gentleman." ¹

A paragraph in Locke's next letter to Boyle shows that, though he was still intent upon his medical and scientific studies, he was making arrangements for a temporary, if not a permanent, removal from Oxford to London. "I intend," he said, "to go between this and Easter into Somersetshire, where, if I can do any service about Mendip or any other way, you will oblige me with the employment. It is so much my concernment to receive your commands, that I shall be sure to give you notice where I am and how I may receive the honour of your letters. After some little stay in that county, I hope to kiss your hands in London." ²

In July, 1666, occurred an incident that had a very important effect on Locke's career; his first meeting with Lord Ashley, afterwards the famous Earl of Shaftesbury, unfortunately most famous as the subject of the inimitable satire in which Locke's schoolfellow, Dryden, painted in colours nearly as untrue as they were brilliant the chief opponent of divine right monarchy in the days of the later Stuarts.

¹ Boyle 'Works,' vol. v., p. 567; Locke to Boyle, 24 Feb., 1666-7.

² *Ibid.*, vol. v., p. 568; Locke to Boyle, 24 March, 1666-7.

“Of these the false Achitophel was first ;
 A name to all succeeding ages curst :
 For close designs and crooked counsels fit ;
 Sagacious, bold, and turbulent of wit ;
 Restless, unfix'd in principles and place ;
 In power unpleas'd, impatient of disgrace :
 A fiery soul, which, working out its way,
 Fretted the pigmy body to decay,
 And o'er-inform'd the tenement of clay :
 A daring pilot in extremity,
 Pleased with the danger when the waves went high,
 He sought the storms, but, for a calm unfit,
 Would steer too nigh the sands to boast his wit.”¹

And in somewhat less familiar lines :—

“A martial hero first, with early care
 Blown, like a pigmy by the winds, to war ;
 A beardless chief, a rebel ere a man :
 So young his hatred to his prince began.
 Next this, (how wildly will ambition steer !)
 A vermin wriggling in the usurper's ear,
 Bartering his venal wit for sums of gold,
 He cast himself into the saint-like mould,
 Groan'd, sigh'd, and pray'd, while godliness was gain—
 The loudest bag-pipe of the squeaking train.
 But, as 'tis hard to cheat a juggler's eyes,
 His open lewdness he could ne'er disguise. . . .
 Power was his aim ; but, thrown from that pretence,
 The wretch turn'd loyal in his own defence,
 And malice reconcil'd him to his prince.
 Him, in the anguish of his soul, he serv'd,
 Rewarded juster still than he deserv'd.
 Behold him now exalted into trust :
 His counsel's oft convenient, seldom just.
 E'en in the most sincere advice he gave,
 He had a grudging still to be a knave.

¹ ‘Absalom and Achitophel,’ ll. 150—162.

The frauds he learnt in his fanatic years
 Made him uneasy in his lawful gears ;
 At best as little honest as he could,
 And, like white witches, mischievously good.
 To his first bias longingly he leans,
 And rather would be great by wicked means." ¹

There was truth enough in Dryden's satire to give a sting to its untruth; as Anthony Ashley Cooper, Lord Ashley, born in 1621, had varied; while hardly out of his teens, in support of the Royalist and Roundhead factions, during the later years of Charles the First's life; had helped to bring Cromwell into power, and then had turned against him; had promoted the Restoration, and was already the chief, though not the noisiest, opponent of the tyrannical party which contrived to make Charles the Second its tool. But very few could then taunt him for his political inconsistencies, and those inconsistencies may be reconciled with a genuine, if not altogether exalted, patriotism. He was very ambitious and not very scrupulous; but his hands were cleaner than most men's, and his ambition never, or very rarely, and at worst by accident rather than by design, prevailed over his conscientious desire to promote the civil and religious liberty of his fellow subjects and to maintain the honour of his country.²

Made a baron at the coronation of Charles the Second, and immediately afterwards appointed chancellor of the exchequer and under-treasurer, he had steadily, but vainly, opposed the policy of the high church party, favoured by Clarendon as lord chancellor, and enforced in the corpora-

¹ 'The Medal,' ll. 26—37, 50—64.

² In support of this estimate of Shaftesbury, I may refer to Christie's 'Life of Anthony Ashley Cooper, First Earl of Shaftesbury' (1871), a careful compilation from new and important documents.

tion, uniformity, militia, conventicle and five-mile acts and in other persecuting measures. The high church party had accordingly already learnt to hate him; but he was in good favour with the king, and regarded both by non-conformists and latitudinarians as their great champion in the privy council, and yet more in the cabinet—a term then coming into use to designate the committee of privy councillors and principal advisers of the king, to whom it was thought prudent to confide all the secrets of state.

There seems to have been little or no truth in Dryden's allegations as to Lord Ashley's licentiousness, and it was only by poetic licence that he could be said to have a "pigmy body." He was reckoned a handsome man in his day, and his name is notably absent from the scandalous annals of the most dissolute period of English history; but in May, 1660, while proceeding to Breda with the other commissioners appointed to invite Charles the Second to return as king, the upsetting of his carriage caused an internal abscess which proved to be incurable.¹ That malady, the subject of much coarse and cruel jesting in later years, led to his acquaintance with Locke.

In 1664, Richard Lower, Locke's fellow-student, had discovered the medicinal value of Astrop wells, near King's Sutton, in Northamptonshire, and not quite so far from Oxford as Banbury; and Lower's friend, Dr. Willis, having joined with him in publishing the praises of these waters, the village became for a time the rival of Sunninghill, near Windsor, if not of Bath, as a resort for invalids. Many who preferred to occupy at Oxford more comfortable quarters than Astrop itself contained, had the water brought thither for them to drink. Lord Ashley was at Oxford, for the meeting of parliament, in the autumn of

¹ Christie, 'Life of Shaftesbury,' vol. i., p. 222.

1665, and perhaps he made a first trial of the Astrop waters at that time. He resolved to drink them at any rate when he went to visit his son, who was studying at the university in 1666, and with that object he sought the assistance of David Thomas, of whom he had known something before. "I must request one favour of you," Thomas wrote to Locke from London, "which is to send me word by the next opportunity, whether you can procure twelve bottles of water for my Lord Ashley to drink in Oxford Sunday and Monday mornings: if you can possibly do it, you will very much oblige him and me."¹ Concerning the immediate sequel, all we know is contained in two short narratives.

"Mr. Locke came into my grandfather's family in the summer of the year 1666, recommended by his friend, Mr. Bennet, of the town of Shaftesbury," wrote the third Earl of Shaftesbury in 1705. "The occasion of it was this. My grandfather had been ill for a great while after a fall by which his breast was so bruised that in time it came to an imposthumation within and appeared by a swelling under his stomach. Mr. Locke was at that time a student at Oxford, and my grandfather, taking a journey that way to drink the waters, having Mr. Bennet in the coach with him, he had this young physician presented to him, who, though he had never practised physic, yet appeared to my grandfather to be such a genius, that he valued him above all other physicians, the great men in practice in those times."²

From Lady Masham we have a fuller and probably a more correct account of the important episode. "My Lord

¹ Lord King, p. 404; Thomas to Locke, 9 July, 1666.

² MSS. in the *Remonstrants' Library*; the third Lord Shaftesbury to Le Clerc, 8 Feb., 1704-5, printed in *Notes and Queries*, vol. iii. (1851), p. 97.

Ashley," she wrote, "designing to spend some days with his son at Oxford, had resolved at the same time to drink Astrop medicinal waters there, and had accordingly writ to Dr. Thomas to provide them against his coming. The doctor, being obliged to go out of town, could not do this himself, and requested of his friend Mr. Locke to take the care of getting the waters against my lord's coming. Mr. Locke was no way wanting in this care, but so it fell out that through some fault or misfortune of the messenger employed by him for this purpose, my lord came to town and the waters were not ready for his drinking them the next day, as he had designed to do. Mr. Locke, much vexed at such a disappointment, and to excuse from the blame of it Dr. Thomas, who had entrusted him herein, found himself obliged to wait upon my Lord Ashley, whom he had never before seen, to acquaint him how this had happened. My lord, in his wonted manner, received him very civilly, accepting his excuse with great easiness, and when Mr. Locke would have taken his leave of him, would needs have him to stay supper with him, being much pleased, as it soon appeared, with his conversation. But if my lord was pleased with the company of Mr. Locke, Mr. Locke was yet more so with that of my Lord Ashley. My lord, when Mr. Locke took leave of him, engaged him to dine with him the next day, which he willingly promised, and, the waters being provided against the day following, and Mr. Locke having before had thoughts of drinking them himself, my lord would have him drink them with him, that so he might have the more of his company. When my lord went from Oxford, he went to Sunninghill, where he drank the waters some time, and having before he left Oxford made Mr. Locke promise that he would come to him thither, Mr. Locke,

within a few days, followed him. Soon after my lord, returning to London, desired Mr. Locke that from that time he would look upon his house as his home, and that he would let him see him there in town as soon as he could."¹

Though these two accounts do not quite agree, they show beyond doubt that Locke's acquaintance with Lord Ashley began near the end of July, 1666, and suddenly issued in close and lasting friendship.²

¹ MSS. in the *Remonstrants' Library*; Lady Masham to Le Clerc, 12 January, 1704-5.

² As they are evidently based on Locke's own report to her of his opinion of his friend, though perhaps somewhat exaggerated therefrom, I shall also quote the panegyric on Lord Ashley with which Lady Masham supplemented her account of their first meeting. "The conversation of men of parts, bred with all the advantages which people of quality have, is not ordinarily more different from that of mere scholars than my Lord Ashley's was distinguished from that of other men of his own rank and condition by peculiar agreements. This great man, esteemed by all parties in his country to be the ablest and most consummate statesman in it, if not of the age he lived in, who had a compass of thought, soundness of judgment, and sharpness of penetration that, on some extraordinary instances of his sagacity, has been fancied almost more than merely human, was no less admirable in the qualities and accomplishments that fit men for society. He was very communicative in his nature; had conversed with books a good deal, but with men much more; and, having been deeply engaged in the public affairs of his time at an age when others were scarce thought fit to begin to meddle with them, he had whilst young acquired that experience of things and knowledge of men which few have till they are old; and though this permitted him not the leisure to be any great reader, yet, being able as he was presently to discover the strength of any argument and where the weight of it turned, having besides the advantage of an excellent memory, he always understood more of the books he read from a cursory reading of them than most other men who dwelt longer upon them. As he had every qualification of an excellent speaker (in which great endowment he was esteemed to surpass all who were his contemporaries in either house of parliament), there was in his wit as much vivacity as there was strength and profoundness in

However sudden and hearty that friendship was, however, it does not seem to have had any immediate effect upon Locke's scheme of work. Having spent the first fortnight of August with Lord Ashley at Sunninghill, he went back apparently more resolved than ever to work on as a doctor in Oxford. But in the following spring, after paying a visit to his friends in Somersetshire, it is probable that, on his way back, he spent a few weeks with Lord Ashley at Wimborne St. Giles's, his country house in Dorsetshire. On the 15th of June, 1667, he was at Exeter House, the London residence of Lord Ashley,¹ and "from that time," according to Lady Masham's

his judgment, to which being added a temper naturally gay, unalloyed with melancholy even in age and under his greatest troubles, this happy conjunction gave ever to his most ordinary conversation a very peculiar and agreeable mixture of mirth with instruction, which was still so much the more pleasing in that, as he himself was always easy, he loved that others should be so in his company, being a great enemy to formality, and having above all men the art of living familiarly without lessening anything at all of his dignity. Everything in him was natural, and had a noble air of freedom, expressive of the character of a mind that abhorred slavery, not because he could not be master, but because he could not suffer such an indignity to human nature; and these qualities, so far as they were capable of it, he inspired into all that were about him. In short, Mr. Locke, so long as he lived, remembered with much delight the time he had spent in my Lord Shaftesbury's conversation, and never spoke of his known abilities with esteem only, but with admiration. If those to whom the character of Mr. Locke is best known may from hence conceive a very high idea of my Lord Shaftesbury, it is certain that those who knew my Lord Shaftesbury did never represent Mr. Locke to themselves as a man more extraordinary than when they recalled to their remembrance the singular esteem my Lord Shaftesbury had of him. That two such persons should find an uncommon delight in the company of each other is not to be wondered at, though perhaps it has rarely been known that so firm and lasting a friendship, for so I must call it, has been so suddenly contracted."

¹ Lord King, p. 26; Locke to Strachey, 15 June, 1667.

statement, "he was with my Lord Ashley as a man at home, and lived in that family much esteemed, not only by my lord, but by all the friends of the family."¹

¹ *MSS. in the Remonstrants' Library*; Lady Masham to Le Clerc, 12 January, 1704-5.

CHAPTER IV.

EARLY WRITINGS.

[1660—1667.]

TWO small specimens, more curious than important, of the verse-writing with which Locke occasionally, but perhaps rarely, occupied stray fragments of his time while he was an Oxford student, and two small specimens, very crude but very significant, of the sort of notes that he appears to have been in the habit, then as well as afterwards, of making on philosophical questions, have been given in earlier pages.

In verse-writing he was not successful, and he probably never attempted to succeed in it. His humour, light and varied as it was, generally found expression only in playful conversation with his friends, or in the letters by means of which he maintained a lively intercourse with them when they were at a distance, or—and here he certainly employed it very often—in furnishing apt and homely and very effective illustrations to his serious arguments in metaphysics and ethics, in politics, religion, and other great matters affecting the wellbeing of society.

He was pre-eminently a philosopher—that is, a lover of wisdom. Whether, till late in life at any rate, it ever occurred to him that he could teach much to the world may well be doubted. For a long while he was content to do all he could in teaching himself. With that object

he studied all that Oxford could provide for him ; all that, in his student's quarters at Christ Church, in the society of friends outside of the university, and in the more bustling scenes that he occasionally visited, he could learn of the ways and thoughts of men, and the best means of helping them to lead worthy and happy lives. With that object he read all the books that came in his way, romances and travel-books as well as abstruse treatises of every sort, and applied himself with special eagerness, not only to the medical and kindred researches that were directly connected with the practical work to which he was anxious to devote his life, but also to every other scientific pursuit that he deemed useful in disclosing the secrets of nature and promoting the welfare of mankind. With that object, also, he accustomed himself to write down his thoughts on all kinds of subjects, not, it would seem, with the design of giving them to the world, but in order thus to be the better able to test their value, and see how much truth was in them.

In 1661 he began a series of common-place books, in which many of those thoughts were entered, sometimes in detached sentences, sometimes in lengthy arguments. Before 1661, moreover, he began to write elaborate treatises on very various subjects, as well as to set down on scraps of paper many notes and memoranda which occurred to him in the course of his reading or conversation. It is probable that a large number of these fragments have been lost, and perhaps the fuller essays that remain are only meagre representatives of the many that he prepared. Enough remain, however, to throw welcome light on his mental history, and some account of the more important of them, which can be referred with certainty, or by fair inference—many being undated—to the portion

of his life through which we have as yet followed him, must now be given.

Though his connection with the university was maintained for many years longer, he made a greater change than he appears to have anticipated when, in the early summer of 1667, he left Oxford to find a home with Lord Ashley. After that it was impossible for him to be a mere student, learning to think for himself: he was forced, and not too soon, to begin work as a leader of other men's thoughts. What had he done with his pen to prove his fitness for the task?

Remarkable evidence of Locke's opinions on many points, while he was an Oxford student, appears in a hitherto unknown essay, not dated, but certainly written either before or very soon after the Restoration, entitled 'Reflections upon the Roman Commonwealth.'¹ It occupies forty-six pages of closely written manuscript, each being nearly as full as a page of print, and, though all that we have, probably all that was written, is only the first portion, complete in itself, of the whole work that was projected. It shows that, before writing it, Locke had made a profound study of Roman history and politics, nearly every sentence being supported by a reference to one or more Latin authors. It shows also that he had already arrived at convictions in political science from which he never greatly swerved. In later life he may not have had such an unqualified admiration for Roman institutions as he here expressed; he may have discovered that in some respects he had seen more wisdom

¹ The original, in Locke's handwriting, is among the *Shaftesbury Papers*, series viii., no. 6.

and truer philosophy in those institutions than they really contained; but the political truths that he here held up to admiration in or before the time of Charles the Second, were the political truths that he propounded when he was recognised as the greatest thinker in the England of William the Third.

“Romulus, at the head of a numerous colony from Alba, was the first founder of the Roman state. This colony was, in the original state of nature, free, and independent of any dominion whatsoever, and only chose Romulus for their leader till their new city was built, and they were at liberty to consider what form of government they should resolve upon.” So Locke began his essay; and the Hobbism of the introduction must not be lost sight of. These Alban colonists were in a state of nature, absolutely their own masters; but they found it expedient to band together in a society, and to that end it became necessary that they should elect a leader, a magistrate, into whose hands they surrendered their individual liberties. Their choice of Romulus was fortunate, thought Locke, for he, “immediately after his advancement, erected a frame of government upon such admirable orders, both civil, military, and religious, that, if no alteration had been made in the fundamental laws, by himself or his successors, it would have been the most noble as well as the most lasting constitution of limited monarchy that ever was in the world.”

Locke gave an epitome of this ideal constitution, commending it alike for its assertion of the sanctity of monarchy and strengthening of monarchical power, by providing the king with large revenues from land and with complete executive and much legislative authority, for its arrangement of a nobility dependent on the monarchy

and of clients dependent on the nobles, and for all its political and religious institutions.

“The religious institution,” which, begun by Romulus, was completed by Numa, he said, “whether we consider the simplicity of its precepts, and their mighty influence upon the morality of the people, or their admirable application to all the ends of civil society, and particularly to the support of the monarchy, will appear to be the wisest and the most politic system of religion that ever any lawgiver founded. He did not introduce any opinions unworthy of the Gods and inconsistent with the divine nature; nor did he require the belief of many articles of faith, which create heresies and schisms in the church, and end in the ruin of religion; for, if schisms and heresies were traced up to their original causes, it would be found that they have sprung chiefly from the multiplying articles of faith, and narrowing the bottom of religion by clogging it with creeds and catechisms and endless niceties about the essences, properties, and attributes of God. The common principles of religion all mankind agree in, and the belief of these doctrines a lawgiver may venture to enjoin; but he must go no farther if he means to preserve an uniformity in religion. For the injunctions of positive laws, how much soever they contradict the inclinations of mankind, rarely produce any schisms; so much easier 'tis for men to practise against their passions than believe against their understandings. But Numa, by a wise conduct, prevented all factions and divisions in the church by the institution of only two articles of faith: the first, that the Gods were the authors of all good to mankind; and the second, that to merit this good the Gods were to be worshipped, in which worship the chief of all was to be innocent, good, and just.”

Locke then proceeded at some length to show the wise comprehensiveness of the religion of the Romans. Even the doctrine of the immortality of the soul, though "always cherished and encouraged by the commonwealth as an opinion of great use and service to the state," was not essential with them, being "rather a problem of philosophy than an article of divinity." Justice, "which in a manner comprehends all other moral virtues," was the great virtue required by the Roman religion; which was not "soured with needless severities and affected austerities, by imposing doctrines of penance, abstinence, and mortification, which serve only to cross the innocent appetites of mankind, without making them better or wiser." It was a grand merit in Numa's religion that its "wide bottom" thus "prevented all heresies in fundamentals;" it was no less a merit that "in the particular forms of worship he allowed a general liberty of conscience."

"This generous principle of tolerating all religions in the commonwealth," said Locke, "was that above all others which fitted his system to the chief design of the government; for the rise and progress of the Roman greatness was wholly owing to the mighty confluence of people from all parts of the world, with customs and ceremonies very different from the Romans', who would never have settled there without an allowance of the free exercise of their particular religions."

And the establishment and maintenance of this admirable tolerance he attributed to the fact that the management of the national religion was assigned to the senate and the people, not to the priests. "The government of religion being in the hands of the state was a necessary cause of liberty of conscience. For there is scarce an

instance in history of a persecution raised by a free government. Persecutions are generally made to gratify the pride, the ambition, or the interest of the clergy; which a state that has the command of the national conscience will never indulge at the expense of the public good." "As the Roman religion," he went on to say in very memorable words, "was a part of their policy, so their clergy likewise were a part of their laity, and interwoven with the general interest of the state; not a separate independent body from the rest of the community, nor any considerable balance in the civil government, but settled upon such an institution as they could have neither interest nor power to act against the public good; a constitution which the modern policy has overlooked out of ignorance or neglected out of design, as appears from the unlimited power of the modern priesthood, who have usurped a supremacy, or at least an independency, on the civil power over half of Europe, and, where their jurisdiction is more restrained, by virtue of their great possessions and endowments look the civil government in the face and have raised such convulsions in the latter ages as were unknown to the ancient world."

Locke said much more of excellent purport and to excellent effect on the Roman priesthood and the points of difference between it and the ecclesiastical institutions of later times. He enlarged also on the subject of ecclesiastical revenues, and he greatly commended the arrangement by which in the Roman government it was rendered impossible for priests to amass large property either for themselves or for their order. "It may seem strange to our age, where godliness is such a great gain, that the Roman clergy should serve their Gods for naught; but there will be no reason to wonder if they consider that

none of their civil officers had any pensions, and that their private soldiers fought the battles of the state without pay, for some hundreds of years after the foundation of the city. The Romans took particular care not to trust the state in mercenary hands; and the commons, as Dionysius expressly says, were excluded from the priesthood in regard of their poverty, which would have been no reason had there been any profits or revenues belonging to the order. After the subversion of the commonwealth, the emperors (for priestcraft and tyranny go hand in hand) settled large salaries, stipends, and endowments upon the clergy, and established lands for the maintenance of the vestal virgins. And, indeed, in all ages it has been a current maxim of arbitrary princes to engage the authority of the church to support their tyranny."

After further remarks on the priesthood and priestcraft, Locke examined the civil institutions of Rome. This part of the essay is in itself hardly less interesting than the earlier portions that have been quoted from; but it does not throw so much light on the individual opinions and character of the writer, and, to be thoroughly intelligible, would need to be quoted almost in its entirety. It may suffice, therefore, here to give one interesting specimen.

Having enumerated several other laws wisely established with the design of securing "that no single man, or order of men, by their riches, possessions, or authority, should so overbalance the rest of the community as to aspire to absolute dominion," Locke specified last "the *leges tabellariae*, or the institution of voting by the ballot, which was an expedient found out to preserve the freedom of elections, which were awed and influenced by the greatness and authority of the senators." "This single law

retrieved the fate of the commonwealth for an age, after all the other popular laws were abolished by disuse, or openly invaded and broken in upon by the great men. It was the *vindex libertatis*, and the only barrier that hindered the aristocracy from subverting the popular government by engrossing all the magistracy of the state, which they could have commanded by their interests and dependencies among the people, if a way had not been contrived to conceal the suffrages of the commons and screen them from the resentments of their patrons; and, in such a case, where the people are left to their own liberty, they will make choice, not of those whom they fear, but those whom they esteem and love for their engagement to the national interest. Nor was the ballot only restrained to the elections of magistrates; but at last was indifferently applied to all the public resolutions and determinations of the assemblies of the people."

"Upon the balance of these orders and institutions," Locke said in concluding his treatise, "stood this mighty fabric, immortal from all inward diseases, and invincible by any foreign attacks, had the same conduct and steadiness of counsels been directed to the execution of their laws as was applied to the first founding of them. But the original causes and principles of the corruption and dissolution of this admirable government shall be the subject of another discourse." That other discourse, if it was ever written, has not come down to us.

No criticism of the discourse that we have is needed. Its clear and incisive language speaks for itself. We can hardly doubt that before writing it Locke had read Hobbes's '*De Cive*' and '*De Corpore Politico*,' if not his '*Leviathan*,' and had derived thence the germs of his political philosophy; and it is quite evident that by

personal intercourse with some of the latitudinarian churchmen, as well as by study of their writings, he had been encouraged to hold very bold and liberal views on religious and ecclesiastical affairs. But this essay plainly shows that, while still a modest Oxford student, he had seen occasion to differ widely from Hobbes and to go far beyond the latitudinarians, and that, whatever help he may have obtained from them, he had already formed very definite opinions of his own, which the thought and experience of later years only brought to maturity, both in political philosophy and on religious and ecclesiastical affairs, especially in their relation to politics.

Next perhaps in order of writing to the treatise on the Roman Commonwealth, but discussing ecclesiastical if not religious affairs from a very different point of view, though still in their political relations, was a long essay in which Locke, immediately after the Restoration, gave an affirmative answer to the question, "Whether the civil magistrate may lawfully impose and determine the use of indifferent things in reference to religious worship?" The question of course was answered in the negative by the extreme nonconformists, and Locke carefully analysed the arguments propounded by one of their number, with the purpose of showing the unreasonableness, and yet more the inexpediency, of the position taken up by them when they were invited to exchange the worn-out Commonwealth of the presbyterians for such a monarchy as Charles the Second had promised to establish. The polemical interest of this treatise, however, has now passed away, and it is chiefly valuable for its statement of the grounds on which Locke justified his departure from the puritanism in which he had been trained. "As for myself," he said, "there is no one can have a

greater respect and veneration for authority than I. I no sooner perceived myself in the world, but I found myself in a storm, which has lasted almost hitherto, and therefore I cannot but entertain the approaches of a calm with the greatest joy and satisfaction; and this, methinks, obliges me both in duty and gratitude to endeavour the continuance of such a blessing by disposing men's minds to obedience to that government which has brought with it the quiet settlement which even our giddy folly had put beyond the reach not only of our contrivance but hopes; and I would men would be persuaded to be so kind to their religion, their country, and themselves, as not to hazard again the substantial blessings of peace and settlement in an over-zealous contention about things which they themselves confess to be little, and at most but indifferent."¹

Locke, like the latitudinarians, indulged in many hopes that were never to be realised as to the issue of Charles the Second's restoration. But he had some ground for asking the dissenters to give a fair trial to the liberal scheme of ecclesiastical government which he, like most other moderate politicians, old as well as young, believed that the king was prepared to adopt; and it was not without reason that he pointed to the presbyterian tyranny of the past two or three years in support of his plea for a prelacy that should not be allowed to be tyrannical. "Since I find," he wrote, "that a general freedom is but a general bondage, that the popular asserters of public liberty are the greatest engrossers of it too, and not unfitly called its keepers, I know not whether experience would not give us some reason to think that, were the part of freedom contended for by our author generally

¹ Lord King, p. 8.

indulged in England, it would prove only a liberty for contention, censure, and persecution." "I cannot think," he added, "that the benefits of liberty consist in a liberty for men, at pleasure, to adopt themselves children of God, and from thence assume a title to inheritances here, and proclaim themselves heirs of the world; nor a liberty for ambitious men to pull down well-framed constitutions, that out of the ruins they may build themselves fortunes; nor a liberty to be Christians so as not to be subjects. All the freedom I can wish my country or myself is, to enjoy the protection of those laws which the prudence and providence of our ancestors established, and the happy return of his majesty has restored."¹

Locke lived to discover that Charles the Second's return was not a very happy one for his subjects. He never abandoned his theoretical adhesion to a constitutional monarchy which should have power to restrain the ecclesiastical zeal though not the purely religious tenets of the people, but he probably soon felt that it would be undesirable to publish this treatise, if he had ever thought of doing so.

He was sorely troubled at the revival of ecclesiastical tyranny under Charles the Second, and, without sympathising very much with the tenets of the puritans, he had no sympathy at all with those who persecuted them. Of this we shall find very clear evidence when his 'Essay concerning Toleration' is before us. As an illustration of his views in the years between the writing of that essay and the 'Reflections upon the Roman Commonwealth,' a long entry in his common-place book, headed 'Sacerdos,' is curious. This paper is not dated, but its style, and the fact that many of its sentences were repeated in the essay,

¹ Lord King, pp. 8, 9.

with slight improvements, justify the assumption that it was written before 1667.

“There were two sorts of teachers amongst the ancients,” Locke said at starting. “Those who professed to teach them the arts of propitiation and atonement were properly their priests, who for the most part made themselves the mediators betwixt the Gods and men, wherein they performed all or the principal part; at least, nothing was done without them. Another sort of teachers were called philosophers. These led their schools, and professed to instruct those who would apply to them in the knowledge of things and the rules of virtue. These meddled not with the public religion, worship, or ceremonies, but left them entirely to the priests, as the priests left the instruction of men in natural and moral knowledge wholly to the philosophers. These two parts or provinces of knowledge, thus under the government of two distinct sorts of men, seem to be founded upon the supposition of two clearly distinct originals, namely, revelation and reason. For the priests never, for any of their ceremonies or forms of worship, pleaded reason, but always urged their sacred observances from the pleasure of the Gods, antiquity, and tradition, which at last resolves all their established rites into nothing but revelation. The philosophers, on the other side, pretended to nothing but reason in all that they said, and from thence owned to fetch all their doctrines, though how little their lives answered their own rules, whilst they studied ostentation and vanity rather than solid virtue, Cicero tells us. Jesus Christ, bringing by revelation from heaven the true religion to mankind, re-united these two again, religion and morality, as the inseparable parts of the worship of God, which ought never to have been separated; wherein,

for the obtaining the favour and forgiveness of the Deity, the chief part of what man could do consisted in a holy life, and little or nothing at all was left to outward ceremony, which was therefore almost wholly cashiered out of this true religion, and only two very plain and simple institutions introduced, all pompous rites being wholly abolished, and no more of outward observances commanded but just so much as decency and order required in the actions of public assemblies. This being the state of this true religion coming immediately from God himself, the ministers of it, who also call themselves priests, have assumed to themselves the parts both of the heathen priests and philosophers, and claim a right, not only to perform all outward acts of the Christian religion in public, and to regulate the ceremonies to be used there, but also to teach men their duties of morality towards one another and towards themselves, and to prescribe to them in the conduct of their lives.”¹

Thus connecting the Christian priests or clergy with the priests and philosophers of ancient times, and separating their methods from the simple rules of Christianity as he understood it, Locke severely blamed them for so perverting the religion they professed, that “it hath been the cause of more disorders, tumults and bloodshed than all other causes put together.” “But far be it from any one,” he added, “to think Christ the author of these disorders, or that such fatal mischiefs are the consequence of his doctrine, though they have grown up with it. Antichrist has sown those tares in the field of the church, the rise whereof hath been only hence—that the clergy by

¹ Lord King, pp. 285, 286. I have somewhat abridged the earlier part of the above extract, using only Locke’s words, however, and not altering his sense.

degrees, as Christianity spread, affecting dominion, laid claim to a priesthood derived by succession from Christ, and so independent from the civil power, receiving, as they pretend, by the imposition of hands and some other ceremonies agreed upon, but variously, by the priesthods of the several factions, an indelible character, particular sanctity, and a power immediately from heaven to do several things which are not lawful to be done by other men.”¹

Locke stoutly denied the authority of these insolent assumptions, and forcibly set forth their mischievous nature. “The clergy, as they call themselves, of the Christian religion, in imitation of the Jewish priesthood, having almost ever since the first ages of the church laid claim to this power, separate from civil government, as received from God himself, have—wherever the civil magistrate hath been Christian, and of their opinion, and superior in power to the clergy, and they not able to cope with him—pretended this power only to be spiritual, and to extend no farther; but yet still pressed as a duty on the magistrate to punish and persecute those whom they disliked and declared against; and so when they excommunicated, their under-officer, the magistrate, was to execute. And to reward princes for thus doing their drudgery they have, whenever princes have been serviceable to their ends, been careful to preach up monarchy *jure divino*; but, notwithstanding the *jus divinum* of monarchy, when any prince hath dared to dissent from their doctrines or forms, or been less apt to execute the decrees of the hierarchy, they have been the first and forwardest in giving check to his authority and disturbance to his government. And princes, on the other side, being apt to hearken to such as seem to advance

¹ Lord King, p. 288.

their authority and bring in religion to the assistance of their absolute power, have been generally very ready to worry those sheep who have ever so little straggled out of those shepherds' folds where they were kept in order to be shorn by them both. Hence have come most of those calamities which have so long disturbed and wasted Christendom. Whilst the magistrate, being persuaded it is his duty to punish those the clergy pleases to call heretics, schismatics or fanatics, or else taught to apprehend danger from dissension in religion, thinks it his interest to suppress them, and persecute all who observe not the same forms in the religious worship which is set up in his country, the people on the other side finding the mischiefs that fall on them for worshipping God according to their own persuasion, enter into confederacies and combinations to secure themselves as well as they can; so that oppression and vexation on one side, self-defence and desire of religious liberty on the other, create dislikes, jealousies, apprehensions, and factions, which seldom fail to break out into downright persecution or open war."¹

Those being the bad effects of priestly influence when the clergy have to truckle to the king, Locke found the evil greater when they can openly exercise temporal as well as spiritual authority. "Though Christ declares himself to have no kingdom of this world, his successors have, whenever they can but grasp the power, a large commission to execute, and that a rigorously civil dominion. The popedom hath been a large and lasting instance of this. And what presbytery could do, even in its infancy, when it had a little humbled the magistrates, let Scotland show."²

Though in these early writings on religious affairs Locke

¹ Lord King, pp. 289, 290.

² *Ibid.*, p. 290.

concerned himself especially with ecclesiastical questions, it would be easy to construct from them a very clear account of his theological opinions at this time, opinions which he appears to have held with remarkable consistency all through his life. Here, however, it is sufficient to note that, while he most conspicuously condemned all efforts of self-appointed priests of every sect to usurp and pervert the functions of the civil power, or by cunning devices to induce the civil power to become their agent in coercing or attempting to coerce any who differed from them in modes of worship, he also entirely repudiated their audacious claims as spiritual guides, apart from the civil power, to dictate to any the arbitrary systems of belief that were implied in those modes of worship. He was opposed to the dogmas of puritans and episcopalians, presbyterians and catholics alike. Let each man do his utmost to live up to the ideal of a Christian life as set forth in the Bible, but let no man dare to force upon another his own notions as to what even the Bible teaches.

This was the purport of an eloquent little essay, written in Latin in 1661, which he endorsed, 'Infallibilis Scripturæ Interpres non Necessarius.' Here he made short work of the question whether the church—and he spoke primarily, though not exclusively, of the church of Rome—had any right to claim infallibility in explaining the doctrines of the Bible. He seems to have considered that logic would be almost wasted in handling a dogma that rhetoric could sufficiently dispose of. "It cannot be," he exclaimed, "that what God himself said on Mount Sinai, and what Christ appointed on the Mount of Olives, is to be overruled by a voice from seven-hilled Rome. It would be strange indeed, if God, who made the tongue and the organs of speech, who gave us

all the use of language, cannot be understood, when he declares his will to man, without the help of an interpreter, who thus must know the thoughts of God better than God himself. As if, the words of God being obscure, man could throw light on them! as if the minds of creatures could be more erudite than the mind that formed them!"¹

Though we know that during these years Locke was devoting much of his time to medicine, chemistry, and other sciences, it is perhaps less strange that none of his observations thereupon, save such as have been already referred to in our notices of his correspondence, have come down to us, than that we have so few records of his passing thoughts on philosophical subjects. That he made many such can hardly be doubted; but if so, they have nearly all been lost. Only two passages in his common-place book, coming under this category, seem important enough to be here quoted. But these two are very important, as throwing remarkably clear light on the state of his mind at this period.

The first, which appears to have been written in 1661 or soon after, helps to show, not only that Locke had largely imbibed and greatly improved upon the utilitarian views of Hobbes, but also that he had made enough practicable observation of some perplexing social problems to form a juster estimate of them than the world, after learning so much from him, is yet quite ready to adopt.

"Virtue, as in its obligation it is the will of God, discovered by natural reason, and thus has the force of a law, so in the matter of it it is nothing

¹ *Shaftesbury Papers*, series viii., no. 30.

else but doing of good, either to oneself or others; and the contrary hereunto, vice, is nothing else but doing of harm. Thus the bounds of temperance are prescribed by the health, estates, and the use of our time: justice, truth, and mercy, by the good or evil they are likely to produce; since everybody allows one may with justice deny another the possession of his own sword, when there is reason to believe he would make use of it to his own harm. But since men in society are in a far different estate than when considered single and alone, the instances and measures of virtue and vice are very different under these two considerations; for though, as I said before, the measures of temperance, to a solitary man, be none but those above-mentioned, yet if he be a member of a society, it may, according to the station he has in it, receive measures from reputation and example; so that what would be no vicious excess in a retired obscurity, may be a very great one amongst people who think ill of such excess, because, by lessening his esteem amongst them, it makes a man incapable of having the authority and doing the good which otherwise he might. For, esteem and reputation being a sort of moral strength, whereby a man is enabled to do, as it were by an augmented force, that which others of equal natural parts and natural power cannot do without it, he that by any intemperance weakens this his moral strength does himself as much harm as if by intemperance he weakened the natural strength either of his mind or body, and so is equally vicious by doing harm to himself. This, if well considered, will give us better boundaries of virtue and vice than curious questions stated with the nicest distinctions; that being always the greatest vice whose consequences draw after it the greatest harm; and therefore the injury and mischiefs done to society are much more culpable than those done to private men, though with greater personal aggravations. And so many things naturally become vices amongst men in society, which without that would be innocent actions. Thus, for a man to cohabit and have children by one or more women, who are at their own disposal, and when they think fit to part again, I see not how it can be condemned as a vice, since nobody is harmed, supposing it done amongst persons considered as separate from the rest of mankind. But yet this hinders not but it is a vice of deep dye when the same thing is done in a society wherein modesty, the great virtue of the weaker sex, has often other rules and bounds set by custom and reputation than what it has by direct instances of the law of nature in a solitude or an estate separate from the opinion of this or that society. For if a woman, by transgressing those bounds which the received opinion of her country or religion, and not nature or reason, have set to modesty, has drawn any

blemish on her reputation, she may run the risk of being exposed to infamy and other mischiefs, amongst the least of which is not the danger of losing the comforts of a conjugal settlement, and therewith the chief end of her being, the propagation of mankind.”¹

Whether the other paper that has here to be quoted was written by Locke before 1667 is not clear, but this is most probable, and it may at any rate be taken as a fair epitome of the exalted utilitarianism in accordance with which, both at this period and all through the remainder of his life, he sought to regulate his conduct.

“Thus, I think,” we find him saying, with something like the emphasis of a philosophical Credo :—

“Thus, I think;—It is a man’s proper business to seek happiness and avoid misery. Happiness consists in what delights and contents the mind; misery in what disturbs, discomposes, or torments it. I will therefore make it my business to seek satisfaction and delight, and avoid uneasiness and disquiet; to have as much of the one, and as little of the other, as may be. But here I must have a care I mistake not, for if I prefer a short pleasure to a lasting one, it is plain I cross my own happiness.

“Let me then see wherein consist the most lasting pleasures of this life; and that, as far as I can observe, is in these things :—1st. Health,—without which no sensual pleasure can have any relish. 2nd. Reputation,—for that I find everybody is pleased with, and the want of it is a constant torment. 3rd. Knowledge,—for the little knowledge I have, I find I would not sell at any rate, nor part with for any other pleasure. 4th. Doing good,—for I find the well-cooked meat I eat to-day does now no more delight me, nay, I am diseased after a full meal: the perfumes I smelt yesterday now no more affect me with any pleasure; but the good turn I did yesterday, a year, seven years since, continues still to please and delight me as often as I reflect on it. 5th. The expectation of eternal and incomprehensible happiness in another world is that also which carries a constant pleasure with it.

“If then I will faithfully pursue that happiness I propose to myself, whatever pleasure offers itself to me, I must carefully look that it cross not any of those five great and constant pleasures above mentioned. For

¹ Lord King, pp. 292, 293.

example, the fruit I see tempts me with the taste of it that I love, but if it endanger my health, I part with a constant and lasting for a very short and transient pleasure, and so foolishly make myself unhappy, and am not true to my own interest. Hunting, plays, and other innocent diversions delight me: if I make use of them to refresh myself after study and business, they preserve my health, restore the vigour of my mind, and increase my pleasure; but if I spend all, or the greatest part of my time in them, they hinder my improvement in knowledge and useful arts, they blast my credit, and give me up to the uneasy state of shame, ignorance, and contempt, in which I cannot but be very unhappy. Drinking, gaming, and vicious delights will do me this mischief, not only by wasting my time, but by a positive efficacy endanger my health, impair my parts, imprint ill habits, lessen my esteem, and leave a constant lasting torment on my conscience.

“Therefore all vicious and unlawful pleasures I will always avoid, because such a mastery of my passions will afford me a constant pleasure greater than any such enjoyments; and also deliver me from the certain evil of several kinds, that by indulging myself in a present temptation I shall certainly afterwards suffer. All innocent diversions and delights, as far as they will contribute to my health, and consist with my improvement, condition, and my other more solid pleasures of knowledge and reputation, I will enjoy, but no further, and this I will carefully watch and examine, that I may not be deceived by the flattery of a present pleasure to lose a greater.”¹

By far the most important of Locke's early writings was an unfinished 'Essay concerning Toleration,' which, having previously strung together copious notes on the subject in his common-place book, he put into orderly shape in 1766.² A second part which he projected seems never to have been written, at least as he then projected it; but the portion which we have is complete in itself, and furnishes very valuable illustration both of Locke's

¹ Lord King, p. 304.

² The notes are briefly described by Lord King, p. 156; but the existence of the essay has not hitherto been known. It is here printed from Locke's manuscript in the *Shaftesbury Papers*, series viii., no. 1.

opinions at this time and of the state of things which he wished to remedy.

It is quite possible that his acquaintance with Lord Ashley, beginning in the summer of 1666, may have encouraged him to watch very carefully the political movements in which his new friend was taking an influential part; but, as we have seen, he had for some time past been paying considerable attention to the questions which he here especially discussed.

He held, as in fact did everybody else in those days, that it is the business of the state to take account of the religious welfare of its members, but his opinions on this subject were shared by few, if any, of his contemporaries. Episcopalians and presbyterians, independents and catholics alike considered that the state would in no way fulfil its duty either to God or to man if it did not do the utmost in its power to inculcate the religious tenets which they severally regarded as necessary to salvation. The catholic pretensions were most monstrous, not only because of their greater bigotry in themselves, but also because they expected the state to be merely the humble tool of a foreign ecclesiastic; but Milton had found that "new presbyter is but old priest writ large," and, if the disciples of John Knox shared the tyrannical and persecuting spirit of the papal church, the disciples of Archbishop Laud were, to say the least, as willing to use tyranny and persecution in their efforts to make all ways to heaven but their own as strait and narrow as possible. The independents alone, with John Owen for their chief spokesman in this respect, showed any real disposition to allow the holding of religious opinions with which they did not agree, and, in spite of their fair promises, their brief authority in England—especially if we gauge it by

the standard of the independent rule soon afterwards set up in New England—gave very little prospect of being much better than the dominion of any other of the rival parties. The independents, however, deserve to be honoured as the first of all the Christian sects which, when able to persecute, had any inclination at all to abstain from persecution; and among the men who profited by their teaching, John Locke is conspicuous. He was the one man who, using all that was good in their vague opinions as a groundwork, was able to build thereon a solid structure of sound argument and excellent philosophy, which, if later generations, grown wiser under his guidance, find it in some respects defective, was, to say the least, as complete as his own age could apprehend, and therefore perhaps the best possible for that age.

Locke went far beyond the most liberal of the independents in his plea for toleration, that is, for allowing the utmost freedom of opinion in religious matters to all outside the limits of the national church, and for restraining them only, and then with the utmost kindness and prudence, when under a cloak of religion they put forward social or political views at variance with the true interests of the community.

He also went far beyond the most liberal of the latitudinarian churchmen—with whom, if he is to be ticketed with a sectarian name at all, he must be classed—in his plea for comprehension; that is, for so broadening the area of doctrine and so simplifying the methods of ritual appointed for the national church as to leave to most reasonable persons very little excuse indeed for refusing to belong to it. His opinions on both these points, which in his theory of political science necessarily converged into one, were clearly expressed in his ‘*Reflections on the*

Roman Commonwealth.' He refined the traditional account of Numa's ecclesiastical arrangements until he found in them his ideal. That ideal was certainly very simple. The state, he said in effect, is bound to look after the religion of its subjects. But the state-religion must be of the most comprehensive sort possible. Let the existence of a good God be maintained and publicly recognised by suitable marks of homage; let it also be maintained that the only true worship of God is the worship of good deeds, purity of the individual life, truthful and just dealing towards one's neighbours. Teach those doctrines, and nothing else need be taught; nay, nothing else ought to be taught. "Many articles of faith create heresies and schisms in the church, and end in the ruin of religion; for, if schisms and heresies were traced up to their original causes, it would be found that they have sprung chiefly from the multiplying articles of faith, and narrowing the bottom of religion by clogging it with creeds and catechisms and endless niceties about the essences, properties, and attributes of God." Tolerate every sort of religious opinion that is not distinctly prejudicial to the true interests of society; but if you make your national religion broad enough, if you do not narrow its bottom with dogmas and quibbles, if you do not sour it "with needless severities and affected austerities, which serve only to cross the innocent appetites of mankind, without making them better or wiser," you will have no sectaries to tolerate. So Locke said in or near the year 1660; so he said in substance over and over again throughout the long remainder of his life.

Of course there was nothing peculiar to Locke in his demand for comprehension, any more than in his demand for toleration, save that he was far bolder than any of

his pioneers or fellow-workers, and that his demands were made, not in the interest of any sect or party, but in the interests of the whole community, from the standpoint of a philosopher and statesman, not from that of an apologist or a suitor. In 1637, when he was only five years old, Chillingworth, whom he acknowledged as his teacher in this respect, had used grand words for an episcopalian and a royalist to use. "Protestants," said Chillingworth, "are inexcusable if they offer violence to other men's consciences."¹ "This presumptuous imposing of the senses of men upon the words of God, the special senses of men upon the general words of God, and laying them upon men's consciences under the equal penalty of death and damnation, this vain conceit that we can speak of the things of God better than in the words of God, this deifying of our own interpretations and tyrannous enforcing them upon others, this restraining of the word of God from that latitude and generality, and the understandings of men from that liberty, wherein Christ and the apostles left them, is, and hath been, the only fountain of all the schisms of the church, and that which makes them immortal, the common incendiary of Christendom, and that which tears in pieces, not the coat, but the bowels and members of Christ. Take away these walls of separation, and all will quickly be one; take away this persecuting, burning, cursing, damning of men for not subscribing the words of men as the words of God; require of Christians only to believe Christ, and to call no man master but him only; let those leave claiming infallibility that have no title to it, and let them that in their words disclaim it disclaim it also in their actions."² But Chillingworth wrote those

¹ 'The Religion of Protestants,' ch. v., § 96.

² *Ibid.*, ch. iv., § 17.

sentences and his whole 'Religion of Protestants' as orthodox low churchmen now-a-days might write in controversy with ritualists and catholics, rather to defend protestantism for its revolt from the doctrinal tyranny of the papacy, than to sanction or even extenuate any revolt from the doctrinal tyranny of episcopalian protestantism. He, however, like Grotius before him, and John Hales in his own day, helped to lead the way in a good movement; and he had some excellent disciples among the contemporaries of Locke, the ablest and most broad-minded being Ralph Cudworth and John Tillotson, Locke's friends in later years, if not now.

There were many others whom temporary expediency brought into a show of agreement with Locke on this subject.

Comprehension was the cant word of the years just before and just after the Restoration. The bargain struck between Charles the Second and the puritans who, at Breda, invited him to put on his father's tarnished crown, was a bargain of comprehension. The presbyterians, finding it impossible to maintain much longer the miserable pretence of a republic that mis-shaped itself in their hands after Cromwell's death, deemed it better to take a king who was likely to make large concessions in allowing them to retain their ecclesiastical emoluments and as much as they could of their ecclesiastical dignity, than to make sure the loss of all by clinging recklessly to all. The episcopalians, whether latitudinarians or high churchmen, of course welcomed the change, and, some honestly, some dishonestly, expressed their approval of the talked-of comprehension; and all but the most zealous independents, finding themselves, too weak to resist, or even feeling that resistance would be unpatri-

otic, left things to take their course. King Charles was as true to his word as a mere sensualist—who had no objection to other people being comfortable so long as he was free to seek his own comfort by having for his mistresses as many peeresses and as many actresses as he fancied, and by spending upon them any amount of public money that they desired—could be expected to be. So far as he had any religion at all, moreover, he was a catholic, and reasonably enough, seeing that the church of Rome would gladly have granted him absolution for ten times as many offences as he committed, and was willing to commend his lusts as virtues, on the prospect of bringing England again, through him, under its dominion; and he could therefore have no objection—if he ever gave any thought to the matter—to make the church of England broad enough to include catholics as well as all sorts of protestants within its pale. Hence the compact that was formed, with some avowed conditions, and with a good many conditions or possibilities secretly cherished by each of the parties concerned.

But it did not work well. The presbyterian party to a great extent gained its object, most of its ministers being “comprehended,” and some of them, happily the worthiest, being promoted to bishoprics and other high offices; but the high church party, partly in retaliation for this crime against themselves and God, took care that, if sectaries were admitted into their midst, there should be no comprehension of their opinions, and, first securing the reconstruction of the episcopal church, with all its creeds and articles, next obtained triumph after triumph by the passing of laws for the disabling and persecution of all outsiders. And, if those catholics who were not formal or informal Jesuits, and therefore did not

chose to pass themselves off as protestant churchmen, suffered considerably, the chief sufferers were the independents, or, as they and other sectaries were now generally called, the fanatics. The act of uniformity was passed in 1662, the conventicle act in 1664, and the five-mile act in 1665.

These measures, and the smaller ones that kept them company, did not satisfy the persecuting party; but they alarmed many half-hearted and merely political friends of religious liberty, as well as many about whose honesty and thoroughness of conviction there can be no doubt. The Duke of Buckingham, rising to the foremost place in the king's counsels as the power of Clarendon declined, let it be known that he was opposed to all legislation of this sort. Locke's new friend, Lord Ashley, was a more honest champion of religious liberty; and perhaps it was partly at his instigation, or for his guidance, that Locke set out his views on the subject in his 'Essay concerning Toleration.'

It must be remembered that this essay was prepared eighteen years before Locke's 'Epistola de Tolerantia,' which was written in 1685, and published in an English translation in 1689, and which, with the two other letters that followed it, excited much controversy, and had a considerable effect on public opinion in the days of William the Third. In studying the history of political literature, and of its influence on the national mind, the 'Letters on Toleration' are more important, though as this unpublished essay was doubtless read by such practical politicians as Lord Ashley and the Duke of Buckingham—and as we know that Ashley at any rate was much guided by Locke—there is room for interesting speculation as to its services in directing their efforts to

restrain the disgraceful persecution of dissenters which the high church party was then zealously carrying on. But in studying Locke's mental history, the early essay is, to say the least, quite as important as the subsequent letters.

His 'Reflections upon the Roman Commonwealth' showed us that when he was barely eight-and-twenty years old, and still only an Oxford student, his great desire as regards ecclesiastical matters was for a national church so simple in its creeds and articles that it could include or comprehend nearly all who had any religious opinions at all, while he also desired the completest toleration of every honest person who should find the broadest of all possible broad churches too narrow for him. Now that he was four or five and thirty, living or preparing to live, in London, and beginning to take a more active, though a very unostentatious part in political life,—now, too, that he was painfully conscious of the fixed resolution of the strongest party in the state to listen to no plea for comprehension,—he addressed himself especially to the subject of toleration. Greater mastery of language and fuller development of thought, as well as the altered circumstances under which he wrote, enabled and induced him in 1685, and in subsequent years, to express himself in ways very different from those that he employed in 1667. But there was only enlargement, not divergence, in his views at the later period.

One interesting point must not be lost sight of. The letter of 1685 was written in a foreign city, where Locke was hiding from the persecuting vengeance that in that year reached its consummation, as far as Charles the Second's reign was concerned—royal spite being joined to ecclesiastical intolerance—and when he might reasonably

demand toleration for himself as well as for others. The essay of 1667 was written while the worst persecution from which he was suffering was the withholding by the Oxford authorities of the doctorship in medicine that he wished to obtain, and at a time when he could gain nothing, and might lose much, by putting forward a plea for justice to dissenters. No impartial observer will doubt that personal motives and interests had as little to do with Locke's arguments in the one case as in the other; but some may find stronger proof of his disinterestedness in the short treatise that now follows than in the 'Epistola de Tolerantia.'

AN ESSAY CONCERNING TOLERATION.

"In the question of liberty of conscience, which has for some years been so much bandied amongst us, one thing that hath chiefly perplexed the question, kept up the dispute, and increased the animosity, hath been, I conceive, this, that both parties have, with equal zeal and mistake, too much enlarged their pretensions, whilst one side preach up absolute obedience, and the other claim universal liberty in matters of conscience, without assigning what those things are which have a title to liberty, or showing the boundaries of imposition and obedience.

"To clear the way to this, I shall lay down this for a foundation, which I think will not be questioned or denied, viz. :—

"That the whole trust, power, and authority of the magistrate is vested in him for no other purpose but to be made use of for the good, preservation, and peace of men in that society over which he is set, and therefore that this alone is and ought to be the standard and measure according to which he ought to square and proportion his laws, model and frame his government. For, if men could live peaceably and quietly together, without uniting under certain laws, and growing into a commonwealth, there would be no need at all of magistrates or politics, which were only made to preserve men in this world from the fraud and violence of one another; so that what was the end of erecting of government ought alone to be the measure of its proceeding.¹

¹ In this paragraph Locke concisely states his view, very much "ques-

“There are some that tell us that monarchy is *jure divino*. I will not now dispute this opinion, but only mind the asserters of it that if they mean by this, as certainly they must, that the sole, supreme, arbitrary power and disposal of all things is and ought to be by divine right in a single person, 'tis to be suspected they have forgot what country they were born in, under what laws they live, and certainly cannot but be obliged to declare Magna Charta to be downright heresy. If they mean by monarchy *jure divino*, not an absolute but limited monarchy (which, I think, is an absurdity, if not a contradiction), they ought to show us this charter from heaven, and let us see where God hath given the magistrate a power to do anything but barely in order to the preservation and welfare of his subjects in this life, or else leave us at liberty to believe it as we please; since nobody is bound, or can allow any one's pretensions, to a power (which he himself confesses limited) further than he shows his title.

“There are others who affirm that all the power and authority the magistrate hath is derived from the grant and consent of the people; and to those I say, it cannot be supposed the people should give any one or more of their fellow-men an authority over them for any other purpose than their own preservation, or extend the limits of their jurisdiction beyond the limits of this life.

“This being premised, that the magistrate ought to do or meddle with nothing but barely in order to securing the civil peace and property of his subjects, let us next consider the opinions and actions of men, which, in reference to toleration, divide themselves into three sorts.

“First are all such opinions and actions as in themselves concern not government and society at all, and such are all purely speculative opinions and divine worship.

“Second are such as, in their own nature, are neither good nor bad, but yet concern society and men's conversations one with another, and these are all practical opinions and actions in matters of indifferency.

“Third are such as concern society, but are also good or bad in their own nature, and these are moral virtues and vices.

“I. I say that the first sort only, viz., speculative opinions and divine

tioned and denied,” of the origin of government and the primary condition of political organisation, which was fully expressed in his treatise on ‘Civil Government.’ When considering that treatise, we shall see how far he agreed with, and how far he differed from, Hobbes.

worship, are those things alone which have an absolute and universal right to toleration.

“First, purely speculative opinions, as the belief of the Trinity, purgatory, transubstantiation, antipodes,¹ Christ’s personal reign on earth, etc.; and that in these every man has his unlimited freedom appears, because bare speculations give no bias to my conversation with men, nor, having any influence on my actions as I am a member of any society, but being such as would be still the same with all the consequences of them, though there were no other person besides myself in the world, cannot by any means either disturb the state or inconvenience my neighbour, and so come not within the magistrate’s cognisance. Besides, no man can give another man power (and it would be to no purpose if God should) over that over which he has no power himself. Now that a man cannot command his own understanding, or positively determine to-day what opinion he will be of to-morrow, is evident from experience and the nature of the understanding, which cannot more apprehend things, otherwise than they appear to it, than the eye see other colours in the rainbow than it doth, whether those colours be really there or no.

“The other thing that has just claim to an unlimited toleration is the place, time, and manner of worshipping my God, because this is a thing wholly between God and me, and of an eternal concernment above the reach and extent of politics and government, which are but for my well-being in this world: for the magistrate is but umpire between man and man; he can right me against my neighbour, but cannot defend me against my God. Whatever evil I suffer by obeying him in other things, he can make me amends in this world; but if he force me to a wrong religion, he can make me no reparation in the other world. To which let me add that, even in things of this world over which the magistrate has an authority, he never does, and it would be injustice if he should, any further than it concerns the good of the public, enjoin men the care of their private civil concernments, or force them to a prosecution of their own private interests, but only protects them from being invaded and injured in them by others; which is a perfect toleration. And therefore we may well suppose he hath nothing at all to do with my private interest in another world, and that he ought not to prescribe me the way, or require my diligence, in the prosecution of that good which is of a far higher concernment to me than any-

¹ It will be remembered that the question as to the earth’s roundness was, even in Locke’s day, one of fierce theological dispute.

thing within his power; having no more certain or more infallible knowledge of the way to attain it than I myself, where we are both equally inquirers, both equally subjects, and wherein he can give me no security that I shall not—nor make me any recompence if I do—miscarry. Can it be reasonable that he that cannot compel me to buy a house should force me his way to venture the purchase of heaven? that he that cannot in justice prescribe me rules of preserving my health should enjoin me methods of saving my soul? he that cannot choose a wife for me should choose a religion? But if God (which is the point in question) would have men forced to heaven, it must not be by the outward violence of the magistrate on men's bodies, but the inward constraints of his own spirit on their minds, which are not to be wrought on by any human compulsion; the way to salvation not being any forced exterior performance, but the voluntary and secret choice of the mind; and it cannot be supposed that God would make use of any means which could not reach, but would rather cross, the attainment of the end. Nor can it be thought that men should give the magistrate a power to choose for them their way to salvation, which is too great to give away, if not impossible to part with; since, whatever the magistrate enjoined in the worship of God, men must in this necessarily follow what they themselves thought best, since no consideration could be sufficient to force a man from, or to, that which he was fully persuaded was the way to infinite happiness or infinite misery. Religious worship—being that homage which I pay to that God I adore in a way I judge acceptable to him, and so being an action or commerce passing only between God and myself—hath in its own nature no reference at all to my governor or to my neighbour, and so necessarily produces no action which disturbs the community. For kneeling or sitting in the sacrament can in itself tend no more to the disturbance of the government or injury of my neighbour than sitting or standing at my own table: wearing a cope or surplice in the church can no more alarm or threaten the peace of the state than wearing a cloak or coat in the market: being re-baptised no more make a tempest in the commonwealth than it doth in the river, nor than barely washing myself would do in either. If I observe the Friday with the Mahometan, or the Saturday with the Jew, or the Sunday with the Christian; whether I pray with or without a form; whether I worship God in the various and pompous ceremonies of the papists, or in the plainer way of the Calvinists; I see nothing in any of these, if they be done sincerely and out of conscience, that can of itself make me either the worse subject to my prince or worse neighbour to my fellow-subject; unless it be

that I will, out of pride or overweeningness of my own opinion and a secret conceit of my own infallibility, taking to myself something of a godlike power, force and compel others to be of my mind, or censure or malign them if they be not. This, indeed, often happens; but 'tis not the fault of the worship but the men, and is not the consequence of this or that form of devotion, but the product of depraved ambitious human nature, which successively makes use of all sorts of religion, as Ahab did of keeping a fast, which was not the cause, but means and artifice, to take away Naboth's vineyard. Which miscarriages of some professors do no more discredit any religion (for the same happens in all) than Ahab's rapine does fasting.

“ From what is premised I think will follow :—

“ That in speculations and religious worship every man hath a perfect uncontrollable liberty which he may freely use without, or contrary to, the magistrate's command, without any guilt or sin at all, provided always that it be all done sincerely and out of conscience to God, according to the best of his knowledge and persuasion. But, if there be any ambition, pride, revenge, faction, or any such alloy that mixes itself with what he calls conscience, so much there is of guilt, and so much he shall answer for at the day of judgment.

“ II. I say all practical principles, or opinions, by which men think themselves obliged to regulate their actions with one another; as that men may breed their children, or dispose of their estates, as they please; that men may work or rest when they think fit; that polygamy and divorce are lawful or unlawful, etc.—these opinions and the actions following from them, with all other things indifferent, have a title also to toleration; but yet only so far as they do not tend to the disturbance of the state, or do not cause greater inconveniences than advantages to the community. For all these opinions, except such of them as are apparently destructive to human society, being things either of indifferency or doubt, and neither the magistrate nor subject being on either side infallible, he ought no further to consider them than as the making laws and interposing his authority in such opinions may conduce to the welfare and safety of his people. But yet no such opinion has any right to toleration on this ground, that it is a matter of conscience and some men are persuaded that it is either a sin or a duty; because the conscience or persuasion of the subject cannot possibly be a measure by which the magistrate can or ought to frame his laws, which ought to be suited to the good of all his subjects, not the persuasions of a part, which, often happening to be contrary one to another, must produce contrary laws; and,

there being nothing so indifferent which the consciences of some or other do not check at, a toleration of men in all that which they pretend out of conscience they cannot submit to will wholly take away all the civil laws and all the magistrate's power, and so there will be no law nor government if you deny the magistrate's authority in indifferent things over which it is acknowledged on all hands that he has jurisdiction. And therefore the errors or scruples of any one's conscience, which lead him to, or deter him from, the doing of anything, do not destroy the magistrate's power, nor alter the nature of the thing, which is still indifferent; for I will not doubt here to call all these practical opinions in respect of the law-maker indifferent, though perhaps they are not so in themselves. For, however the magistrate be persuaded in himself of the reasonableness or absurdity, necessity or unlawfulness of any of them, and is possibly in the right, yet, whilst he acknowledges himself not infallible, he ought to regard them, in making of his laws, no otherwise than as things indifferent, except only as that, being enjoined, tolerated, or forbidden, they carry with them the good and welfare of the people, though at the same time he be obliged strictly to suit his personal actions to the dictates of his own conscience and persuasion in those very opinions. For, not being made infallible in reference to others by being made a governor over them, he shall hereafter be accountable to God for his actions as a man, according as they are suited to his own conscience and persuasion; but shall be accountable for his laws and administration as a magistrate, according as they are intended to the good, preservation, and quiet of all his subjects in this world as much as possible; which is a rule so certain and so clear that he can scarce err in it unless he do it wilfully.

“ But before I proceed to show the limits of restraint and liberty in reference to those things, it will be necessary to set down the several degrees of imposition that are or may be used in matters of opinion.

“ (1.) The prohibiting to publish or vent any opinion.

“ (2.) Forcing to renounce or abjure any opinion.

“ (3.) Compelling to declare an assent to the contrary opinion.

“ There are answerable to these the same degrees of toleration, from all which I conclude,

“ (1.) That the magistrate may prohibit the publishing of any of those opinions when they tend to the disturbance of the government, because they are then under his cognisance and jurisdiction.

“ (2.) That no man ought to be forced to renounce his opinion, or assent to the contrary, because such a compulsion cannot produce any real effect to

that purpose for which it is designed. It cannot alter men's minds; it can only force them to be hypocrites; and by this way the magistrate is so far from bringing men to embrace the truth of his opinion, that he only constrains them to lie for their own. Nor does this injunction at all conduce to the peace or security of the government; but quite the contrary, because hereby the magistrate does not make any one to be one jot the more of his mind, but to be very much more his enemy.

“(3.) That any actions flowing from any of these opinions, as also in all other indifferent things, the magistrate has a power to command or forbid so far as they tend to the peace, safety, or security of his people, whereof though he be judge, yet he ought still to have a great care that no such laws be made, no such restraints established, for any other reason but because the necessity of the state and the welfare of the people called for them, and perhaps it will not be sufficient that he barely thinks such impositions and such rigour necessary or convenient, unless he hath seriously and impartially considered and debated whether they be so or no; and his opinion (if he mistake) will no more justify him in the making of such laws than the conscience or opinion of the subject will excuse him if he disobey them, if consideration and inquiry could have better informed either of them. And I think it will easily be granted that the making of laws to any other end but only for the security of the government and protection of the people in their lives, estates, and liberties, *i.e.*, the preservation of the whole, will meet with the severest doom at the great tribunal, not only because the abuse of that power and trust which is in the law-maker's hands produces greater and more unavoidable mischiefs than anything else to mankind, for whose good only governments were instituted, but also because he is not accountable to any tribunal here; nor can there be a greater provocation to the supreme preserver of mankind than that the magistrate should make use of that power which was given him only for the preservation of all his subjects, and every particular person amongst them, as far as it is practicable, to misuse it to the service of his pleasure, vanity, or passion, and employ it to the disquieting and oppression of his fellow-men, between whom and himself, in respect of the King of kings, there is but a small and accidental difference.

“(4.) That if the magistrate, in these opinions or actions by laws and impositions, endeavour to restrain or compel men contrary to the sincere persuasions of their own consciences, they ought to do what their consciences require of them, as far as without violence they can? but withal are bound at the same time quietly to submit to the penalty the law inflicts

on such disobedience; for by this means they secure to themselves their grand concernment in another world and disturb not the peace of this, offend not against their allegiance either to God or the king, but give both their due,—the interest of the magistrate and their own being both safe. And certainly he is a hypocrite, and only pretends conscience, and aims at something else in this world, who will not, by obeying his conscience and submitting also to the law, purchase heaven for himself and peace for his country, though at the rate of his estate, liberty, or life itself. But here also the private person, as well as the magistrate in the former case, must take great care that his conscience or opinion do not mislead him in the obstinate pursuit or flight of anything as necessary or unlawful which in truth is not so, lest by such an error or wilfulness he come to be punished for the same disobedience in this world and the other too: for, liberty of conscience being the great privilege of the subject, as the right of imposing is the great prerogative of the magistrate, they ought the more narrowly to be watched that they do not mislead either magistrate or subject because of the fair pretences they have, those wrongs being the most dangerous, most carefully to be avoided, and such as God will most severely punish, which are done under the specious semblances and appearances of right.

“ III. I say there are besides the two former a third sort of actions which are thought good or bad in themselves; viz., the duties of the second table, or trespasses against it, or the moral virtues of the philosophers. These, though they are the vigorous active part of religion, and that wherein men’s consciences are very much concerned, yet I find that they make but a little part of the disputes of liberty of conscience. I know not whether it be that, if men were more zealous for these, they would be less contentious about the other. But this is certain, that the countenancing virtue is so necessary a prop to a state, and the allowance of some vices brings so certain a disturbance and ruin to society, that it was never found that any magistrate did, nor can be suspected that he ever will, establish vice by a law or prohibit the practice of virtue, which does by its own authority, and the advantages it brings to all governments, sufficiently establish itself everywhere. Yet give me leave to say, however strange it may seem, that the law-maker hath nothing to do with moral virtues and vices, nor ought to enjoin the duties of the second table any otherwise than barely as they are subservient to the good and preservation of mankind under government. For, could public societies well subsist, or men enjoy peace or safety, without the enforcing of those duties by the injunctions and penalties of laws, it is certain the law-

maker ought not to prescribe any rules about them, but leave the practice of them entirely to the discretion and consciences of his people. For, could even those moral virtues and vices be separated from the relation they have to the weal of the public, and cease to be a means to settle or disturb men's peace and properties, they would then become only the private and super-political concernment between God and a man's soul, wherein the magistrate's authority is not to interpose. God hath appointed the magistrate his vicegerent in this world, with power to command; but 'tis but, like other deputies, to command only in the affairs of that place where he is vicegerent. Whoever meddle in the concernments of the other world have no other power but to entreat and persuade.

“The magistrate hath nothing to do with the good of men's souls or their concernments in another life, but is ordained and entrusted with his power only for the quiet and comfortable living of men in society one with another, as hath been already sufficiently proved. And it is yet further evident that the magistrate commands not the practice of virtues because they are virtuous and oblige the conscience, or are the duties of man to God and the way to his mercy and favour, but because they are the advantages of man with man, and most of them the strong ties and bonds of society, which cannot be loosened without shattering the whole frame; for some of them which have not that influence on the state, and yet are vices, and acknowledged to be so as much as any,—as covetousness, disobedience to parents, ingratitude, malice, revenge, and several others,—the magistrate never draws his sword against; nor can it be said that those are neglected because they cannot be known, when the secretest of them, revenge and malice, put the distinction in judicature between manslaughter and murder. Yea, even charity itself, which is certainly the great duty both of a man and a Christian, hath not yet, in its full latitude, an universal right to toleration; since there are some parts and instances of it which the magistrate hath absolutely forbidden, and that, for aught I could ever hear, without any offence to the tenderest consciences; for who doubts that to relieve with an alms the poor, though beggars (if one sees them in want), is, if considered absolutely, a virtue and every particular man's duty; yet this is amongst us prohibited by a law and the rigour of a penalty, and yet nobody in this case complains of the violation of his conscience or the loss of his liberty, which certainly, if it were an unlawful restraint upon the conscience, could not be overlooked by so many tender and scrupulous men. God does sometimes (so much does he take care of the preservation of government) make his law in some degrees submit and comply with man's; his law forbids the vice, but the law of man often

makes the measure of it. There have been commonwealths that have made theft lawful for such as were not caught in the fact, and perhaps 'twas as guiltless a thing to steal a horse in Sparta as to win a horse-race in England. For the magistrate, having a power of transferring properties from one man to another, may establish any¹, so they be universal, equal and without violence, and suited to the interest and welfare of that society, as this was at Sparta, who, being a warlike people, found this no ill way to teach their citizens vigilancy, boldness, and activity. This I only note, by the by, to show how much the good of the commonwealth is the standard of all human laws, when it seems to limit and alter the obligation even of some of the laws of God, and change the nature of vice and virtue. Hence it is that the magistrate who could make theft innocent could not yet make perjury or breach of faith lawful, because destructive to human society.

“From the power, therefore, that the magistrate hath over good and bad actions, I think it will follow,—

“(1.) That he is not bound to punish all, *i.e.*, he may tolerate some vices; for, I would know, what government in the world doth not?

“(2.) That he ought not to command the practice of any vice, because such an injunction cannot be subservient to the good of the people, or preservation of the government.

“(3.) That if it can be supposed that he should command the practice of any vice, the conscientious and scandalised subject is bound to disobey his injunctions, and submit to his penalty, as in the former case.

“These, I suppose, are the limits of imposition and liberty, and these three several sorts of things wherein men's consciences are concerned have right to such a latitude of toleration as I have set down, and no more, if they are considered separately and abstractly in themselves. But yet there are two cases or circumstances which may still upon the same grounds vary the magistrate's usage of the men that claim this right to toleration.

“(1.) Since men usually take up their religion in gross, and assume to themselves the opinions of their party all at once in a bundle, it often happens that they mix with their religious worship and speculative opinions other doctrines absolutely destructive to the society wherein they live, as is evident in the Roman Catholics that are subjects of any prince but the pope. These, therefore, blending such opinions with their religion, reverencing

¹ Locke probably in copying his manuscript here by accident dropped out the word “laws.”

them as fundamental truths, and submitting to them as articles of their faith, ought not to be tolerated by the magistrate in the exercise of their religion, unless he can be secured that he can allow one part without the spreading of the other, and that the propagation of those opinions may be separated from their religious worship, which, I suppose, is very hard to be done.

“(2.) Since experience vouches the practice, and men are not all saints that pretend conscience, I think I shall not injure any party if I say that most men, at least factions of men, when they have power sufficient, make use of it, right or wrong, for their own advantage and the establishment of themselves in authority, few men forbearing to grasp at dominion that have power to seize and hold it. When, therefore, men herd themselves into companies with distinctions from the public, and a stricter confederacy with those of their own denomination and party than other their fellow-subjects—whether the distinction be religious or ridiculous it matters not, otherwise than as the ties of religion are stronger and the pretences fairer and apter to draw partisans, and therefore the more to be suspected and the more needfully to be watched—when, I say, any such distinct party is grown or growing so numerous as to appear dangerous to the magistrate and seem visibly to threaten the peace of the state, the magistrate may and ought to use all ways, either of policy or power that shall be convenient, to lessen, break, and suppress the party, and so prevent the mischief. For, though their separation were really in nothing but religious worship, and he should use as the last remedy force and severity against them who did nothing but worship God in their own way, yet would he not really persecute their religion or punish them for that more than in a battle the conqueror kills men for wearing white ribbons in their hats or any other badge about them, but because this was a mark they were enemies and dangerous; religion, *i.e.*, this or that form of worship, being the cause of their union and correspondence, not of their factiousness and turbulency. For the praying to God in this or that posture does no more make men factious or at enmity one with another, nor ought otherwise to be treated than the wearing of hats or turbans, which yet either of them may do, by being a note of distinction, and giving men an opportunity to number their forces, know their strength, be confident of one another, and readily unite upon any occasion. So that they are not restrained because of this or that opinion or worship, but because such a number of any opinion whatsoever who dissented would be dangerous. The same thing would happen if any fashion of clothes, distinct from that of the magistrate and those that adhere to him, should spread itself and become the badge of a very considerable part of the people, who

thereupon grow into a very strict correspondency and friendship one with another. Might not this well give the magistrate cause of jealousy, and make him with penalties forbid the fashion, not because unlawful, but because of the danger it might occasion? Thus a lay cloak may have the same effect with an ecclesiastical cowl or any other religious habit.

“And perhaps the Quakers, were they numerous enough to become dangerous to the state, would deserve the magistrate’s care and watchfulness to suppress them, were they no other way distinguished from the rest of his subjects but by the bare keeping on their hats, as much as if they had a set form of religion separate from the state; in which case nobody would think that the not standing bare were a thing the magistrate levelled his severity against, any otherwise than as it united a great number of men, who, though they dissented from him in a very indifferent and trivial circumstance, yet might thereby endanger the government; and in such case he may endeavour to suppress and weaken or dissolve any party of men which religion or any other thing hath united, to the manifest danger of his government, by all those means that shall be most convenient for that purpose whereof he is to be judge, nor shall he be accountable in the other world for what he does directly in order to the preservation and peace of his people, according to the best of his knowledge.

“Whether force and compulsion be the right way to this end I will not here dispute; but this I dare affirm, that it is the worst, the last to be used, and with the greatest caution, for these reasons:—

“(1.) Because it brings that upon a man which, that he might be freed from, is the only reason why he is a member of the commonwealth, viz., violence. For, were there no fear of violence, there would be no government in the world, nor any need of it.

“(2.) Because the magistrate, in using of force, does in part cross what he professes to do, which is the safety of all; for, the preservation, as much as is possible, of the property, quiet, and life of every individual being his duty, he is obliged not to disturb or destroy some for the quiet and safety of the rest, till it has been tried whether there be no ways to save all. For, so far as he undoes or destroys the safety of any of his subjects for the security of the rest, so far he opposes his own design, which is professed and ought to be only for preservation, to which even the meanest have a title. ’Twould be but an uncharitable as well as unskilful way of cure, and such as nobody would use or consent to, to cut off so much as an ulcered toe, though tending to a gangrene, till other gentler remedies had proved unsuccessful, though it be a part as low as the earth and far distant from

the head.¹ I can see but one objection that can be made to this, and that is, that by the application of gentler remedies such slow methods may make you lose the opportunity of those remedies that, if timely, would be effectual, whereas, in your faint way of proceeding, the malady increases, the faction grows strong, gathers head, and becomes your master. To this I answer, That parties and factions grow slowly and by degrees, have their time of infancy and weakness, as well as full growth and strength, and become not formidable in an instant, but give sufficient time for experimenting other kind of cures, without any danger by the delay. But if the magistrate chance to find the dissenters so numerous as to be in a condition to cope with him, I see not what he can gain by force and severity, when he thereby gives them the fair pretence to embody and arm and make them all united the firmer against him. But this, bordering something upon that part of the question which concerns more the interests of the magistrate than his duty, I shall refer to a fitter place.

“Hitherto I have only traced out the bounds that God hath set to the power of the magistrate and the obedience of the subject, both which are subjects, and equally owe obedience to the great King of kings, who expects from them the performance of those duties which are incumbent on them in their several stations and conditions; the sum whereof is that,

“(1.) There are some opinions and actions that are wholly separate from the concernment of the state, and have no direct influence upon men’s lives in society, and those are all speculative opinions and religious worship, and these have a clear title to universal toleration, which the magistrate ought not to entrench on.

“(2.) There are some opinions and actions which are in their natural tendency absolutely destructive to human society, as, that faith may be broken with heretics, that if the magistrate doth not reform religion the subjects may, that one is bound to broach and propagate any opinion he believes himself, and such like, and, in actions, all manner of frauds and injustice, etc., and these the magistrate ought not to tolerate at all.

“(3.) There is a third sort of opinions and actions which in themselves do not inconvenience or advantage human society, but only as the temper of the state, and posture of affairs, may vary their influence to good or bad—as, that polygamy is lawful or unlawful, that flesh or fish is to be eaten

¹ This is an instance of Locke’s very frequent use of illustrations drawn from his medical studies.

or abstained from at certain seasons, and such other practical opinions, and all actions conversant about matters of indifferency,—and have a right to toleration so far only as they do not interfere with the advantages of the public or serve any way to disturb the government.

“ And thus far of toleration as it concerns the magistrate’s duty. Having showed what he is bound in conscience to do, it will not be amiss to consider a little what he ought to do in prudence.

“ But because the duties of men are contained in general established rules, but their prudence is regulated by circumstances relating to themselves in particular, it will be necessary, in showing how much toleration is the magistrate’s interest, to come to particulars.

“ To consider therefore the state of England at present, there is but this one question in the whole matter, and that is, whether toleration or imposition be the readiest way to secure the safety and peace, and promote the welfare of this kingdom ?

“ As to securing your safety and peace, there is but one way, which is that your friends at home be many and vigorous, and your enemies few and contemptible, or at least that the inequality of their number make it very dangerous and difficult for malcontents to molest you.

“ As to promoting the welfare of the kingdom, which consists in riches and power, to this most immediately conduces the number and industry of your subjects.

“ What influence toleration has on all these cannot be well seen without considering the different parties now among us, which may well be comprehended under these two, papists and fanatics.

“ As to the papists, ’tis certain that several of their dangerous opinions, which are absolutely destructive to all governments but the pope’s, ought not to be tolerated in propagating their opinions ; and whosoever shall spread or publish any of them the magistrate is bound to suppress so far as may be sufficient to restrain it. And this rule reaches not only the papists, but any other sort of men amongst us ; for such restraint will something hinder the spreading of those doctrines which will always be of ill-consequence, and, like serpents, never be prevailed on by kind usage to lay by their venom.

“ Papists are not to enjoy the benefit of toleration, because, where they have power, they think themselves bound to deny it to others. For it is unreasonable that any should have a free liberty of their religion who do not acknowledge it as a principle of theirs that nobody ought to persecute

or molest another because he dissents from him in religion. For, toleration being settled by the magistrate as a foundation whereon to establish the peace and quiet of his people, by tolerating any who enjoy the benefit of this indulgence, which at the same time they condemn as unlawful, he only cherishes those who profess themselves obliged to disturb his government as soon as they shall be able.

“It being impossible, either by indulgence or severity, to make papists, whilst papists, friends to your government, being enemies to it both in their principles and interest, and therefore considering them as irreconcilable enemies, of whose fidelity you can never be secured whilst they owe a blind obedience to an infallible pope, who has the keys of their consciences tied to his girdle, and can, upon occasion, dispense with all their oaths, promises, and the obligations they have to their prince, especially being an heretic, and arm them to the disturbance of the government, I think they ought not to enjoy the benefit of toleration. Because toleration can never, but restraint may, lessen their number, or at least not increase it, as it does usually all other opinions, which grow and spread by persecution, and recommend themselves to bystanders by the hardships they undergo; men being forward to have compassion to sufferers, and esteem for that religion as pure, and the professors of it as sincere, which can stand the test of persecution. But I think it is far otherwise with catholics, who are less apt to be pitied than others, because they receive no other usage than what the cruelty of their own principles and practices are known to deserve; most men judging those severities they complain of just punishments due to them as enemies to the state, rather than persecutions of conscientious men for their religion, which indeed it is not; nor can they be thought to be punished merely for their consciences who own themselves at the same time subjects of a foreign prince and enemy. Besides, the principles and doctrines of that religion are less apt to take inquisitive heads and unstable minds. Men commonly, in their voluntary changes, do pursue liberty and enthusiasm, wherein they are still free and at their own disposal, rather than give themselves up to the authority and impositions of others. This is certain, that toleration cannot make them divide amongst themselves, nor a severe hand over them, as in other dissenting parties, make them cement with the fanatics—whose principles and worship and tempers are so utterly inconsistent—and, by that means increasing the numbers of the united malcontents, make the danger greater. Add to this, that popery, having been brought in upon the ignorant and zealous world by the art and industry of their clergy, and kept up by the same artifice, backed by power and

force, it is the most likely of any religion to decay where the secular power handles them severely, or at least takes from them those encouragements and supports they received by their own clergy.

“But, if restraint of the papists do not lessen the number of our enemies in bringing any of them over to us, yet it increases the number, it strengthens the hands, of our friends, and knits all the protestant party firmer to our assistance and defence. For the interest of the king of England, as head of the protestants, will be much improved by the discountenancing of popery amongst us. The differing parties will sooner unite in a common friendship with us, when they find we really separate from and set ourselves against the common enemy both to our church and all protestant professions; and this will be an hostage of our friendship to them, and a security that they shall not be deceived in the confidence they have of us, and the sincerity of the accord we make with them.

“All the rest of the dissenters come under the opprobrious name of fanatics; which, by the way, I think might with more prudence be laid aside and forgotten; for, what understanding man, in a disordered state, would find out and fix notes of distinction—a thing to be coveted only by those that are factious—or, by giving one common name to different parties, teach those to unite whom he is concerned to divide and keep at a distance one among another?

“But to come to what is more material. I think it is agreed on all hands that it is necessary the fanatics should be made useful and assisting, and as much as possible firm to the government as it now stands, both to secure it from disturbance at home and defend it against invasions from abroad, which nothing can possibly bring to pass but what is able to alter their minds and bring them over to your profession, or else, if they do not part with their opinions, yet may persuade them to lay by their animosities, and become friends to the state, though they are not sons of the church.

“What efficacy force and severity hath to alter the opinions of mankind—though history be full of examples, and there is scarce an instance to be found of any opinion driven out of the world by persecution, but where the violence of it at once swept away all the professors too—I desire no one to go further than his own bosom for an experiment whether ever violence gained anything upon his opinion; whether even arguments managed with heat do not lose something of their efficacy, and have not made him the more obstinate in his opinion; so chary is human nature to preserve the liberty of that part wherein lies the dignity of a man, which could it be imposed on, would make him but little different from a beast.

I ask those who in the late times so firmly stood the ineffectual force of persecution themselves, and found how little it obtained on their opinions, and yet are now so forward to try it upon others, whether all the severity in the world could have drawn them one step nearer to a hearty and sincere embracing the opinions that were then uppermost. Let them not say it was because they knew they were in the right, for every man in what he believes has so far this persuasion that he is in the right. But how little this obstinacy or constancy depends upon knowledge may appear in those galley slaves who return from Turkey, who, though they have endured all manner of miseries rather than part with their religion, yet one would guess by the lives and principles of most of them that they had no knowledge of the doctrine and practice of Christianity at all. Who thinks not that those poor captives who, for renouncing a religion they were not over-instructed in, nor during the enjoyment of their freedom at home over-zealous for, might have regained their liberty for changing their opinions, would not, had their chains given them leave, have cut the throats of those cruel patrons who used them so severely, to whom they would yet have done no violence, had they been treated civilly like fair prisoners of war? Whereby we may see it would be an hazardous attempt, if any should design it, to bring this island to the condition of a galley, where the greater part shall be reduced to the condition of slaves, be forced with blows to row the vessel, but share in none of the lading, nor have any privilege or protection, unless they will make chains for all those who are to be used like Turks, and persuade them to stand still whilst they put them on. For, let divines preach duty as long as they will, 'twas never known that men lay down quietly under the oppression and submitted their backs to the blows of others, when they thought they had strength enough to defend themselves.

“I say not this to justify such proceedings, which in the former part of this discourse I think I have sufficiently condemned; but to show what the nature and practice of mankind is, and what has usually been the consequence of persecution. Besides, the forcible introducing of opinions keeps people off from closing with them, by giving men unavoidable jealousies that it is not truth that is thus carried on, but interest and dominion that is sought in making proselytes by compulsion. Who takes this course to convince any one of the certain truths of mathematics? 'Tis likely it will be said that those are truths on which depend not my happiness. I grant it, and am much indebted to the man that takes care I should be happy: but 'tis hard to think that that comes from charity to my soul which brings such ill-usage to my body, or that he is much concerned I should be happy

in another world who is pleased to see me miserable in this. I wonder that those who have such a zealous regard to the good of others do not a little more look after the relief of the poor, or think themselves concerned to guard the estates of the rich, which certainly are good things too, and make a part of our happiness, if we may believe the lives of those who tell us of the joys of heaven, but endeavour as much as others for large possessions on earth.

“But, after all this, could persecution not only now and then conquer a tender, faint-hearted fanatic (which yet it rarely does, and that usually by the loss of two or three orthodox), could it, I say, at once drive all dissenters within the pale of the church, it would not thereby secure, but more threaten, the government, and make the danger as much greater as it is to have a false, secret, but exasperated enemy, rather than a fair, open adversary. For punishment and fear may make men dissemble; but, not convincing anybody’s reason, cannot possibly make them assent to the opinion, but will certainly make them hate the person of their persecutor and give them the greater aversion to both. Such compliers only prefer impunity to the declaring of their opinion, but do not thereby approve of yours. Fear of your power, not love of your government, is that which restrains them, and if that be the chain that ties them to you, it would certainly hold them surer were they open dissenters than secret malcontents, because it would not only be something easier to be worn, but harder to be knocked off; at least, this is certain, that, compelling men to your opinion, any other way than by convincing them of the truth of it, makes them no more your friends than forcing the poor Indians by droves into the rivers to be baptised made them Christians.

“Though force cannot master the opinions men have, nor plant new ones in their breasts, yet courtesy, friendship, and soft usage may; for several men whose business or laziness keeps them from examining take many of their opinions upon trust, even in things of religion, but never take them from any man of whose knowledge, friendship, and sincerity they are not well assured; which it’s impossible they should be of one that persecutes them.

“But inquisitive men, though they are not of another man’s mind because of his kindness, yet they are the more willing to be convinced, and will be apt to search after reasons that may persuade them to be of his opinion whom they are obliged to love.

“Since force is a wrong way to bring dissenters off from their persuasions, and by drawing them to your opinion you cement them fast to the state, it will certainly prevail much less with those to be your friends who stead-

fastly retain their persuasion and continue in an opinion different from you. He that differs in an opinion is only so far at a distance from you ; but if you use him ill for that which he believes to be right, he is then at perfect enmity. The one is barely a separation, but the other a quarrel. Nor is that all the mischief which severity will do among us as the state of things is at present ; for force and harsh usage will not only increase the animosity but number of enemies. For the fanatics, taken all together, being numerous, and possibly more than the hearty friends to the state-religion, are yet crumbled into different parties amongst themselves, and are at as much distance from one another as from you, if you drive them not farther off by the treatment they receive from you. For their bare opinions are as inconsistent one with another as with the church of England. People, therefore, that are so shattered into different factions are best secured by toleration ; since, being in as good a condition under you as they can hope for under any, 'tis not like they should join to set up another, whom they cannot be certain will use them so well. But, if you persecute them, you make them all of one party and interest against you, tempt them to shake off your yoke, and venture for a new government, wherein every one has hopes to get the dominion themselves, or better usage under others, who cannot but see that the same severity of the government which helped them to power and partisans to get up, will give others the same desire and same strength to pull them down ; and therefore may it be expected they will be cautious how they exercise it. But, if you think the different parties are already grown to a consistency, and formed into one body and interest against you, whether it were the hardships they suffered under you made them unite or no, when they are so many as to equal or exceed you in number, as, perhaps, they do in England, force will be but an ill and hazardous way to bring them to submission. If uniformity in England be so necessary as many pretend, and compulsion be the way to it, I demand of those who are so zealous for it, whether they really intend by force to have it or no. If they do not, it is not only imprudent, but malicious, under that pretence, by ineffectual punishments to disquiet and torment their brethren. For to show how little persecution, if not in the extremest degree, has been able to establish uniformity, I shall ask but this one plain question : Was there ever a free toleration in this kingdom ? If there were not, I desire to know of any of the clergy who were once sequestered, how they came to be turned out of their livings, and whether impositions and severity were able to preserve the church of England and hinder the growth of puritans, even before the war. If, therefore, violence be to settle uniformity,

'tis in vain to mince the matter. That severity which must produce it cannot stop short of the total destruction and extirpation of all dissenters at once. And how well this will agree with the doctrine of Christianity, the principles of our church, and reformation from popery, I leave them to judge who can think the massacre of France worthy their imitation, and desire them to consider, if death (for nothing less can make uniformity) were the penalty of not coming to common-prayer and joining in all our church worship, how much such a law would settle the quiet and secure the government of the kingdom.

“The Romish religion that had been but a little while planted, and taken but small root in Japan (for the poor converts had but little of the efficacious truths and light of Christianity conveyed to them by those teachers who make ignorance the mother of devotion, and knew very little beyond an Ave Mary or Pater-noster), could not be extirpated but by the death of many thousands; which, too, prevailed not at all to lessen their numbers, till they extended the severity beyond the delinquents, and made it death, not only to the family that entertained a priest, but also to all of both the families that were next neighbours on either hand, though they were strangers or enemies to the new religion, and invented exquisite lingering torments, worse than a thousand deaths, which, though some had strength enough to endure fourteen days together, many renounced their religion, whose names were all registered with a design that, when the professors of Christianity were all destroyed, these too should be butchered all on a day, never thinking the opinion rooted out beyond possibility of spreading again, as long as there were any alive who were the least acquainted with it, or had almost heard anything of Christianity more than the name. Nor are the Christians that trade there to this day suffered to discourse, fold their hands, or use any gesture that may show the difference of their religion. If any one thinks uniformity in our church ought to be restored, though by such a method as this, he will do well to consider how many subjects the king will have left by that time it is done. There is this one thing more observable in the case, which is, that it was not to set up uniformity in religion (for they tolerate seven or eight sects, and some so different as is the belief of the mortality or immortality of the soul; nor is the magistrate at all curious or inquisitive what sect his subjects are of, or does in the least force them to his religion), nor any aversion to Christianity, which they suffered a good while quietly to grow up among them, till the doctrine of popish priests gave them jealousy that religion was but their pretence, but empire their design, and made them fear the subversion of their state; which suspicion their own priests improved all they could to the extirpation of this growing religion.

“But to show the danger of establishing uniformity. To give a full prospect of this subject there remain yet these following particulars to be handled:—

“(1.) To show what influence toleration is like to have upon the number and industry of your people, on which depends the power and riches of the kingdom.

“(2.) If force must compel all to an uniformity in England, to consider what party alone or what parties are likeliest to unite to make a force able to compel the rest.

“(3.) To show that all that speak against toleration seem to suppose that severity and force are the only arts of government and way to suppress any faction, which is a mistake.

“(4.) That for the most part the matters of controversy and distinction between sects are no parts, or very inconsiderable ones and appendices, of true religion.

“(5.) To consider how it comes to pass that Christian religion hath made more factions, wars, and disturbances in civil societies than any other, and whether toleration and latitudinism would prevent those evils.

“(6.) That toleration conduces no otherwise to the settlement of a government than as it makes the majority of one mind, and encourages virtue in all, which is done by making and executing strict laws concerning virtue and vice, but making the terms of church communion as large as may be; *i.e.*, that your articles in speculative opinions be few and large, and ceremonies in worship few and easy, which is latitudinism.

“(7.) That the defining and undertaking to prove several doctrines which are confessed to be incomprehensible, and to be no otherwise known but by revelation, and requiring men to assent to them in the terms proposed by the doctors of your several churches, must needs make a great many atheists.

“But of these when I have more leisure.”

CHAPTER V.

IN LORD ASHLEY'S FAMILY.

[1667—1672.]

LOCKE was thirty-four years old when his acquaintance with Lord Ashley began. After very thorough schooling and university education according to the academic requirements of those days, corrected and greatly widened by his readings and original studies in philosophy and science, he had resolved, in spite of seductive offers of advancement both in the diplomatic and in the clerical professions, to become a physician. There is nothing, however, to show that he had as yet done much, if anything, in actual medical practice. Always mistrusting his own powers, and, even when he used those powers, apparently unconscious that he was doing or was able to do anything great, he had chosen still to be a student, a humble searcher after wisdom, a careful and untiring gleaner of all the knowledge he could acquire, hoping that some day he might be able to apply that knowledge in benefiting other people, but feeling perhaps that it would be almost criminal folly in him to attempt to benefit others without first, not only seeing whether he was competent to benefit himself, but also achieving somewhat in that direction.

Happily for him, his circumstances were such as to render possible this sort of life and work. Receiving about

70*l.* a year in rents from his Somersetshire property, and retaining his Christ Church studentship, he had enough, considering the value of money in those days, to enable him to live comfortably as a quiet bachelor, and, though it is evident, from stray allusions in his correspondence, that he would have liked to have a larger income, he was not in actual need of it. He doubtless now looked forward to the time when he should be a busy and prosperous physician, and it may be fairly assumed that in the meanwhile, besides the great interest that he took in medical and other scientific pursuits for their own sakes, he considered that those pursuits were very helpful in training him for the philosophical studies in which he always had special delight. Descartes and some other famous men had taught him that the solution of physical problems furnished the only ground on which, with any chance of success, might be built a superstructure of metaphysical theories.

But, whatever the plans that he had made for his future, they were greatly interfered with by his intimacy with Lord Ashley, and by his failing health.

His father died of consumption, or some kindred malady, at the comparatively early age of fifty-four; and his only brother died also of consumption when he was only about six-and-twenty. We are told nothing as to the state of his own health up to the period of his life at which we have now arrived; but it is probable that only prudent habits had thus far kept sound a delicate constitution. From this time we shall meet with repeated allusions to his ailments, and shall find that, with all his care of himself, and the zealous help of the many friends who did their utmost to keep him alive, he was seriously hampered by complicated and increasing infirmities, the

chief one being the same to which his father and brother had succumbed. This must be remembered as a constant condition of his life, painfully impeding all his schemes of work, and occasionally inducing a state of mind altogether at variance with its otherwise robust character.

Its first effect appears in his forced abandonment of medicine, not as a serious pursuit, but as a business. "Some time after that Mr. Locke had begun to study in earnest," says Lady Masham, "he applied himself principally to physic—a science which he yet never afterwards made use of to his profit, as not being well able to bear the fatigue those must undergo who would bring themselves into any considerable practice, and as having no need of this whereby to live at his ease. But, though he professed not the practice of physic, his judgment was always of great weight with the ablest physicians of his time."¹ Had not Lord Ashley found other work for him, however, it is probable that he would have established himself as a regular physician.

The precise terms upon which, after their friendship had stood the test of a year, he became a member of Lord Ashley's family, are not clear. But it would seem that Lord Ashley, being himself in bad health, and suffering from a malady that no physician could explain, and that was every day becoming more painful—having also at Oxford a son, now fifteen years old, who was too much of an invalid, if not too much of a dullard, to get any good out of his university life—and having, moreover, formed a very high opinion of the mental and moral worth of his new friend—persuaded Locke to

¹ *MSS. in the Remonstrants' Library*; Lady Masham to Le Clerc, 12 Jan., 1704-5.

reside with him as physician to his family, tutor to his son, and adviser to himself on all matters of public and private importance, leaving him free to spend a large portion of his time in his own pursuits. That, at any rate, was the result of the arrangement. "Mr. Locke grew so much in esteem with my grandfather," wrote the third Lord Shaftesbury, "that, as great a man as he experienced him in physic, he looked upon this as but his least part. He encouraged him to turn his thoughts another way; nor would he suffer him to practise physic except in his own family, and as a kindness to some particular friend. He put him upon the study of the religious and civil affairs of the nation, with whatsoever related to the business of a minister of state, in which he was so successful that my grandfather soon began to use him as a friend, and consult with him on all occasions of that kind."¹

This account is in the main correct, though, as we have seen, Locke began to study the affairs of the nation long before he knew Lord Ashley, and, as we shall see, for a long time afterwards he continued his medical work in a desultory way.

The first evidence we have as to the commencement of Locke's settled life in London is furnished by a letter written in June, 1667, to his friend John Strachey. The object of this letter was to allay the alarm that Strachey was likely to feel at hearing of the national calamity of the 12th of June, when the Dutch fleet, having entered the Thames, destroyed some English ships off Chatham, damaged several others, and then halted in the Medway,

¹ MSS. in the Remonstrants' Library, printed in *Notes and Queries*, vol. iii. (1851), p. 98; Third Lord Shaftesbury to Le Clerc, 8 Feb., 1704-5.

waiting, it was thought, for a convenient tide to help them to the capture of London. "I believe report hath increased the ill news we have here," Locke wrote. "Therefore, to abate what possibly fear may have rumoured, I send you what is vouched here for nearest the truth." That he proceeded to do; adding, "It was neither excess of courage on their part, nor want of courage in us, that brought this loss upon us; for, when the English had powder and shot, they fought like themselves, and made the Dutch feel them; but whether it were fortune, or fate, or anything else, let time and tongues tell you, for I profess I would not believe what every mouth speaks."¹

This letter helps to show that Locke, being now lodged within the inner circle of political gossip, if not of political life, took a lively interest in politics; but the time had not yet arrived for him to play any important part in the affairs of state. Now, and for a year or two to come, he appears to have been to Lord Ashley little more than a family physician, tutor, and private friend. The calls thus made upon him do not appear at first to have occupied him very much. We shall presently see that all through this stage of his connection with Lord Ashley he was able—notwithstanding the alleged stipulation that he was only to attend on the Ashley family—to do much kindred work elsewhere, and to devote a great deal of time to general studies and pursuits in medicine.

Exeter House, in the Strand, Lord Ashley's town residence till 1676, when it was pulled down and the site put to other uses, was Locke's home for about eight years after the spring of 1667, though he was frequently in residence at Oxford, or visiting other places on business

¹ Lord King, p. 26; Locke to Strachey, 15 June, 1667.

or pleasure of his own, or in Lord Ashley's company at Wimborne St. Giles's, his country house in the north-east corner of Dorsetshire, and in other parts. "The place I am in at present," he wrote to Boyle in November, 1667, "and the remove I am like to make (for I believe I shall cross the seas before I settle), have kept me from attempting any further experiments in chemistry, though I find my fingers still itch to be at it."¹ He does not seem to have crossed the seas again till 1672; but at this time, though more than ever a student of science, he apparently had not very close relations with Boyle and the chemists. He was too much occupied in practical work as a doctor, and especially in attendance on one famous patient.

The internal malady from which Lord Ashley had been suffering ever since 1661, and which had been the accidental ground of his acquaintance with Locke in 1666, now caused him great agony, and in spite of all Locke's efforts to alleviate it by medicinal treatment, threatened to kill him. "My Lord Ashley is like to die," wrote Pepys on the 19th of June, 1668, "having some imposthume in his breast, that he hath been fain to cut into his body." That operation was performed, and Ashley's life was saved, by Locke.²

¹ Boyle, 'Works,' vol. v., p. 568; Locke to Boyle, 12 Nov., 1667.

² From the very copious notes of the case made by Locke, it appears that Lord Ashley's state began to excite alarm about the end of May, the abscess having apparently then commenced discharging itself internally. On the 11th of June other medical men were called in for a consultation, and, with their concurrence, Locke, on the 12th, applied caustic to the affected outside part, and opened a wound into the abdomen. Through that aperture, which he kept open by means of a silver tube, he removed the cause of offence, attending to it generally two or three times each day, and this treatment was continued till the 3rd of September, when the worst danger

Lord Ashley, soon in great part restored to health, was not ungrateful for the service thus rendered to him by his physician. From this time the physician was his fast friend and his adviser, though not always his guide, on all important affairs. "Mr. Locke was not only with my grandfather in his library and his closet," said the third Lord Shaftesbury, in the narrative already quoted from, "but in company with the great men of those times, the Duke of Buckingham, Lord Halifax, and others, who, being men of wit and learning, were as much taken with him. For, together with his serious, respectful, and humble character, he had a mixture of pleasantry and a

was over. Then arose a new question. Should the silver tube be kept in its place, or should it be removed and the aperture allowed to heal up? Locke sent a sort of circular, inviting opinions on this point and on others incidental to it, to Sir George Ent, Dr. Francis Glisson, Dr. Micklethwaite, and Dr. Timothy Clark, the most famous physicians of the day, and to Dr. Thomas Sydenham, a physician infinitely superior to them all, but then, and for some time after, looked upon by most other doctors, and by the great mass of the public who followed their lead, as little better than a quack. All but Dr. Clark substantially agreed with Locke, that, though it was very desirable to have the wound closed up, it must be kept open till it was quite clear that no further discharge had to be made, lest, by closing it, there should be a new depositing of poison in the abdomen; and Locke's bold plan was adopted. Satirists afterwards made great fun of Lord Ashley's silver tube; but the silver tube kept him alive to hear their satire.

Besides consulting the leading English doctors, Locke collected as many instances as he could of like abscesses, and letters on the subject from four country doctors have been preserved. He also wrote to an eminent foreign physician, the Abbé de Briolay de Beaupreau, of Angers, and obtained his sanction to the course he had adopted. "I can hardly decide," wrote the Abbé, in April, 1669, "whether I ought to admire more the wise and timely proceedings of my lord's physicians, or the exactness of the author of the relation, both for the elegance of his style and the judicious remarks with which he has illustrated his narrative."—*Shaftesbury Papers*, series viii. no. 2; —a large bundle of documents, giving full details of the facts here epitomised.

becoming boldness of speech. The liberty he could take with these great men was peculiar to such a genius as his. A pleasant instance of it runs in my mind. At an appointed meeting of two or three of these great men at my grandfather's house, more for entertainment and good company than for business, it happened that, after a few compliments, the cards were called for, and, the court fashion prevailing, they were engaged in play before any conversation was begun. Mr. Locke sat by as a spectator for some time. At last, taking out his table-book, he began to write something very busily, till, being observed by one of the lords and asked what he was meditating, 'My lords,' said he, 'I am improving myself the best I can in your company; for having impatiently waited this honour of being present at such a meeting of the wisest men and greatest wits of the age, I thought I could not do better than write your conversation; and here I have it in substance, all that has passed for this hour or two.' The great men felt the ridicule, and took pleasure in improving it. They quitted their play, and fell into a conversation becoming them, and so passed the remainder of the day."¹

That anecdote probably belongs to a period somewhat later than the one we are now considering. Locke was still chiefly occupied "in the private affairs and concerns of a family which was in every respect so happy in him that he seemed as a good guardian angel sent to bless it."²

This same third Lord Shaftesbury gives nearly all the information we possess as to Locke's employment as

¹ *Notes and Queries*, vol. iii. (1851), p. 98; Third Lord Shaftesbury to Le Clerc, 8 Feb., 1704-5.

² *Ibid.*

tutor to his father, Anthony Ashley, who had left Oxford, after two years' stay there, just at the time when Locke began to reside at Exeter House.¹ "When Mr. Locke first came into the family," he says, "my father was a youth of about fifteen or sixteen. Him my grandfather entrusted wholly to Mr. Locke for what remained of his education. He was an only child, and of no firm health, which induced my grandfather, in concern for his family, to think of marrying him as soon as possible."²

The sequel is naïvely told by the same informant. "He was too young and inexperienced to choose a wife for himself, and my grandfather too much in business to choose one for him. The affair was nice; for, though my grandfather required not a great fortune, he insisted on good blood, good person and constitution, and above all, good education, and a character as remote as possible from that of court-or-town-bred lady. All this was thrown upon Mr. Locke, who being already so good a judge of men, my grandfather doubted not of his equal judgment in women. He departed from him, entrusted and sworn, as Abraham's head servant 'that ruled over all that he had,' and went into a far country (the north of England), 'to seek for his son a wife,' whom he as successfully found."³

Locke does not seem to have had quite so much responsibility in this delicate business as we are there given to understand; but he was a prime mover in it, and it forms a curious episode in his life. It is clear that Lord Ashley, though cured as far as he could be of his chief malady,

¹ Christie, 'Life of the First Earl of Shaftesbury,' (1871), vol. ii., p. 32.

² *Notes and Queries*, vol. iii. (1851), p. 98; Third Lord Shaftesbury to Le Clerc, 8 Feb., 1704-5.

³ *Ibid.*

felt his own life uncertain, and was very anxious that his only son should not die without leaving an heir to the family name and estates. As early as the autumn of 1668, before the lad was seventeen, he sought to get him married. An alliance with a niece of the Earl of Warwick was then talked of, but soon broken off through a disagreement about the dowry. A second plan, for a marriage with a niece of John Evelyn's, started a few months later, also fell through. It was in a third project that Locke is said to have been the matchmaker. In the summer of 1669 he accompanied young Ashley on a visit to the Earl of Rutland, at Belvoir Castle, near Grantham, in Lincolnshire, and there opened negotiations for the marriage of his pupil with the earl's daughter, Lady Dorothy Manners, who was now about twenty years old; and these negotiations were soon brought to a successful issue.¹

"I hear from my Lady Rutland," Lord Ashley wrote from Wimborne St. Giles's, in August, to "his muchesteemed friend, Mr. John Locke," at Belvoir, "that my lord and his family resolve to be in London the beginning of next month, and then finish the marriage. So that I think my son may best come away to me, and he shall from London meet his lady as they come up; so that you must settle an intelligence both for the time and stages of their journey."² Locke wrote back to say that Lady Rutland wished the wedding to take place at Belvoir; and Lord Ashley replied that, "so the marriage be despatched," he quite agreed to the proposal. "I never thought of prescribing any place," he added, "only begged it might receive no delay, both to satisfy my son

¹ Christie, vol. ii., pp. 33, 35.

² *Shaftesbury Papers*, series ii., no. 175; Shaftesbury to Locke, 29 August, 1669.

and avoid all uncertainties in an affair so agreeable to all my wishes. I have sent to London to provide wedding clothes and all other things. My best blessing to my dear son, and desire him to present my most affectionate service to my Lady Dorothy, who has highly obliged me in all her carriage in this affair, having done all with so much sweetness and prudence as gives me the assurance of the greatest happiness in her, both to myself and family. I hope my son has presented her with the two jewels I sent him, the diamond cross and pendants." "Sir," the letter ends, "you have in the greatest concerns of my life been so successively and prudently kind to me, that it renders me eternally your most affectionate friend and servant."¹

Locke working as a matchmaker seems out of place; but as he succeeded, and gave great satisfaction to all who were concerned, we must suppose that he did the business gracefully. He appears, at any rate, to have made a very good selection. Young Ashley, though weak in body and not strong in mind, by no means deserved Dryden's coarse abuse,² and Lady Dorothy appears to have been well pleased with her husband of seventeen, and to have worthily pleased all with whom she came in contact.

She resided partly at St. Giles's and partly at Exeter House, and while in town she needed a good deal of Locke's attention. She had a miscarriage in January, 1669-70, when Locke was her doctor. "I acknowledge the favour of your letter, although an account most un-

¹ *Shaftesbury Papers*, series ii., no. 176; Shaftesbury to Locke, 6 Sept., 1669. Both these letters are quoted by Mr. Christie, but, as there are inaccuracies in his copying, I have followed the originals.

² 'Absalom and Achitophel,' ll. 169-172.

welcome," wrote Lady Rutland to him. "I am sure I owe much to your care of my dear child in this and favours all manner of ways. Give my blessing, with all affectionate prayers, to poor Doll. And on Wednesday I shall, God permitting, write to her in hope she may be able to read it, and begin to follow your advices, which the Lord of heaven make her to do, to his glory and all our comforts."¹ Lady Dorothy was again very ill, and a similar disaster was anticipated, in August of the same year.² At this time her life seems to have been in danger, and Locke had to send a comforting letter to Lady Rutland. "I am much obliged to you," the old lady replied, "for representing unwelcome tidings with all advantages to draw consolation from; and, blessed be God, her own hand this day gives me assurances that your hopes were not in vain. The Lord preserve her and reward your compassionate cares for her."³

Lord Ashley's hopes for a grandson were at last realised. On the 26th of February, 1670-1,⁴ Locke assisted at the birth of the little Anthony, who as third Earl of Shaftesbury, and author of the 'Characteristics,' was destined to make nearly as great a name in literature as his grandfather was now making in politics. He wrote, as usual, to inform the Countess of Rutland of her daughter's health, and this time he had better news to give. "I most thankfully acknowledge God's great goodness," was

¹ *Shaftesbury Papers*, series ii., no. 185; Lady Rutland to Locke, 31 Jan. 1669-70.

² *Additional MSS.*, no. 5714, in the British Museum; medical notes by Locke, which will be described hereafter.

³ *Shaftesbury Papers*, series ii., no. 190; Lady Rutland to Locke, 27 August, 1670.

⁴ *Ibid.*, series v., no. 1.

the answer, "and am obliged to own your justice that are pleased so amply to make satisfaction for some kind though unwelcome accounts. The Lord's name be blessed and praised for her well-doing and safely bringing that noble family so hopeful an heir."¹

In the following June Locke accompanied Lord Ashley to St. Giles's for a few weeks, and there he looked after the baby, while Lady Dorothy and her husband paid a visit to Belvoir. Two letters from Lady Dorothy show that she missed Locke's company as a friend no less than as a doctor. "I am so much obliged to you," she wrote in the first, "for your letter and kind account and care of my dear one, that I am forced to give you trouble by this letter, and must tell you I do find so much alteration in my health and strength, that I most heartily wish you here every day, for I am sure this place would at this time do you all the good in the world." But, being away from her doctor and her baby, she was tired of Lincolnshire. "I wish I was at St. Giles's with my lord and lady, and where I should see you there with them."² "I return you ten thousand thanks for your letter this day," she wrote a fortnight later. "Longer than this day se'nnight I cannot stay here, unless I am commanded by his lordship; for this two or three days I do find my condition makes me most unfitting for to be here, where I find every day so many wonderful disturbances that I must be at rest somewhere. Nothing is more pleasant than the thoughts to see his lordship, and my lady, and yourself too. If you

¹ *Shaftesbury Papers*, series viii., no. 11; Lady Rutland to Locke, 7 March, 1670-1. No. 210 in series ii. is another letter from Lady Rutland to Locke, dated 10 March, 1670-1.

² *Ibid.*, series viii., no. 12; Lady Dorothy Ashley to Locke, 1 July, 1671.

can, sir, let me hear from you this week, I shall be glad; for else we shall be gone the next, and hear nothing."¹

Lady Ashley was not now at St. Giles's, as Lady Dorothy supposed, but at Petworth, the residence of the Earl of Northumberland. Of this Lady Ashley we do not hear very much; but she seems to have been an excellent wife (his third) to Lord Ashley, a wise and affectionate mother to her sickly step-son and his lively little wife, and a very good friend—"your faithful friend to serve you," she styled herself—to Locke. She was not a great scribe, but in this July she answered a gossiping letter in which Locke had told her of her husband's recovery from an attack of gout and had reported some news he had just received from London. "Though I am very ill at this exercise in all kinds," she said, "yet my earnest inclination to express my gratitude upon every occasion will not suffer me to omit this return of my thanks to you for the best of news you sent me of my dear lord's welfare, and of the gallant actions of our island adventurers"—probably the raid of Morgan and his brother buccaneers of Jamaica at Panama—"and also of the old dotage and young folly of the senseless English and Irish contrivance, overthrown by the French experience in gallantry, all which in several ways is very entertaining"²—not entertaining to us, however, as we do not know what was the matter referred to.

Next month, Lord Ashley and his son being at St. Giles's, his wife and his daughter-in-law were in London, with Locke to look after them. "I have received yours of the 27th instant," wrote Ashley on the 29th of August, "with the most welcome news, both to me and my son, of my

¹ *Shaftesbury Papers*, series viii., no. 15; Lady Dorothy Ashley to Locke, 15 July, 1671.

² *Ibid.*, series viii., no. 14; Lady Ashley to Locke, 14 July, 1671.

wife's, my Lady Dorothy's, and the little boy's health." And he subscribed himself, "Your very affectionate friend to serve you."¹

Those extracts from the letters of the Ashley family help us to understand Locke's position in it at this time. Further evidence of Lord Ashley's gratitude to the man who had saved his life is contained in a letter written by him to Dr. Fell, the dean of Christ Church, which also throws some curious light on Locke's relations with the university and college authorities.

In 1666, it will be remembered, Lord Clarendon had issued an instruction—which was not complied with—that the degree of doctor of medicine should be conferred on Locke, although he had not conformed to the ordinary routine; and in the same year Charles the Second had granted Locke a "dispensation" to retain his student's place at Christ Church, although a faculty studentship in medicine was not available for him, and though he declined to make sure his standing in the college by taking holy orders. It seems that he was anxious to exchange the irregular studentship by royal favour for a more certain and better-defined position, and that Lord Ashley had used influence with the Duke of Ormond, who had succeeded Clarendon as chancellor of the university in August, 1669, with a view towards his obtaining the doctor's degree, which his absence from Oxford still prevented him from gaining in the usual way, on the occasion of an entertainment that was to be offered at Oxford in the week before Christmas, 1670, to William, Prince of Orange, now visiting the king, his uncle, when, according to custom, some complimentary

¹ *Shaftesbury Papers*, series ii., no. 191; Lord Ashley to Locke, 29 August, 1671.

degrees were to be given in honour of the event.¹ Dr. Richard Allestree, now canon of Christ Church as well as provost of Eton, and Dr. Dolben, now dean of Westminster as well as bishop of Rochester and destined soon to be archbishop of York, who are referred to in Lord Ashley's letter, were high churchmen possessing great influence in university matters.

"You are well acquainted," Lord Ashley wrote to Dean Fell, on the 8th of December, 1670, "with the kindness I have great reason to have to Mr. Locke, on whose behalf I had prevailed with the Duke of Ormond for his assistance towards attaining his doctor's degree at the reception of the Prince of Orange; and I am apt to think the instance of your chancellor, and the relation he has to me, would not have been denied by the university. But Mr. Locke, understanding the provost of Eton declared himself and you dissatisfied with it, has importuned me to give him leave to decline it, which, upon conference with my worthy friend the bishop of Rochester, I have done, and returned his grace's letter; though my lord bishop of Rochester can tell you I could not but complain to him that your chapter had not been so kind to him in Mr. Locke's affairs as I thought I might justly expect, considering him a member of their house, having done both my life and family that service I own from him, and I being of that quality I am under his majesty, under which title alone I pretend to any favour from them. All that I request now of you and them is, that, since he will not allow me to do him this kindness, you will give me leave to bespeak your favour for the next faculty place, and

¹ There is a lively account of this ceremony in a letter written by Sir Robert Southwell to Secretary Williamson near the end of December, among the *Domestic State Papers* in the Record Office.

that a more powerful hand may not take it from him. I rely very much on my Lord Rochester's mediation and your own kindness to me." ¹

From this letter we can see, not only that Locke desired to maintain his connection with Christ Church and continued to look upon medicine as his regular calling; but also that the jealousy on the part of the high church party, which had kept from him the doctor's degree in 1666, still prevailed. He evidently asked that the Duke of Ormond's letter might be cancelled, because he had private knowledge that it would not be attended to, and did not care thus to court refusal a second time.

With two men, about equally esteemed by him, though the one has acquired much greater reputation than the other, Locke appears to have made acquaintance very soon after his arrival at Exeter House; or, if he had met them earlier, the acquaintance only now began to develop into close and lasting friendship. These men were Thomas Sydenham and John Mapletoft.

Of Mapletoft, Locke had probably known a little, at any rate, long before, as they were school-fellows for a year or two. He was a king's scholar at Westminster, and left it for Trinity College, Cambridge, four years before Locke proceeded to Oxford, though he was Locke's senior by only fifteen months.² In 1658 he left the university to become tutor to Joceline, Lord Percy, the only son of the tenth Earl of Northumberland. In 1660

¹ *Shaftesbury Papers*, series viii., no. 10*, a copy in Locke's handwriting. The letter is printed in the tenth edition of Locke's 'Works.'

² Most of the following account of Mapletoft's life is taken from Ward, 'Lives of the Gresham Professors' (1740), the copy used being the one in the British Museum, with numerous manuscript additions by the author.

he went to study medicine in France, and afterwards passed a year in Rome in the company of the celebrated Algernon Sydney, who was Lord Percy's cousin.¹ In December, 1662, Lord Percy, just eighteen years old, married Lady Elizabeth Wriothesly, a daughter of the Earl of Southampton, and cousin of Lady Ashley, and a few months after that Mapletoft returned to England and settled down for four years at Petworth as physician to the Northumberland family. In 1667 he obtained the degree of doctor of medicine at Cambridge, and commenced practising as a physician in London, just at the time when Locke began to reside at Exeter House. The old school-fellows became fast friends, and Mapletoft, who had been designed for the church, and entered it in his middle age, and who was intimate with Isaac Barrow, Tillotson, Patrick, Whichcote, and other divines, as well as with Sydenham and other doctors, seems to have helped Locke quickly to make many acquaintances in clerical as well as in medical society.

There is nothing to show that Locke knew Sydenham before he came to London, and Mapletoft is reported to have first brought them together; but it would be almost safe to assume that they were earlier acquainted, though perhaps not very intimately, as many of Locke's old Oxford friends were also Sydenham's friends.

Sydenham was born in 1624—eight years before Locke—at Winford Eagle, in Dorsetshire.² In 1642, or thereabouts, he entered Magdalen Hall, Oxford, as a gentleman com-

¹ Some letters written to him by Lord Percy at this time are among the family papers preserved at Alnwick, described in the appendix to the third Report of the Historical Manuscripts Commission (1873), pp. 62, 63.

² Latham, 'The Works of Sydenham,' (Sydenham Society, 1848,) vol. i., p. xv.

moner, but quitted it soon after, not choosing to serve as a soldier on King Charles's side, as all the students then in the university were expected to do.¹ He was a Roundhead, in a family of Roundheads. There is a tradition, sometimes contradicted, that he himself bore arms on the puritan side; and it is reported that he had a narrow escape, though not in fighting. One night, we are told, a drunken soldier burst into his room, and, catching hold of his shirt, aimed a pistol at his breast, but shot only his own hand, the bullet spending all its force in piercing and shattering his knuckle bones.² But, whatever were Sydenham's occupations during the time of the civil war, while his college career was interrupted, he was able to enter upon the study of medicine soon after the restoration of peace. "It is now thirty years," he wrote in 1675, "since I had the good fortune to fall in with Dr. Thomas Cox. I was on my way to London, with the intention of going thence to Oxford, from which the breaking out of the war had kept me for some years. Dr. Cox asked me what calling I intended to follow. Upon this point my mind was undecided, and I had not even dreamt of medicine; but moved by the advice and encouragement of so great a man, I applied myself seriously to that pursuit; and certainly whatever praise my labours have received from the public is to be gratefully referred to the patron and promoter of my first endeavours."³

It was in 1646 that Sydenham resumed his Oxford

¹ Wood, 'Athenæ Oxonienses,' vol. iv., col. 270.

² *Gentleman's Magazine*, vol. lxxi., (1801), p. 684.

³ 'Observationes Medicæ' (1676), *Epistola Dedicatoria*. A careful edition of all Sydenham's works, in the original Latin, was prepared for the Sydenham Society by Dr. Greenhill (1846).

studies, and "took to the physic line."¹ Without obtaining any other degrees, he was made bachelor of medicine, "on the Pembrokian création," in 1648,² and soon after that he left Oxford, apparently to spend a few years in studying at Montpellier, the great French school of medicine. Before 1661 he was established as a doctor in London, and in 1663 he was made a licentiate of the London college of physicians, a corporation which jealously refused him any higher rank.³ He had to go to Cambridge for the doctorship in medicine which he obtained in 1676,⁴ the diploma being signed by Mapletoft's friend, Isaac Barrow.

Long before that, in spite of the opposition of old-fashioned doctors who resolutely condemned all his new medicines and modes of treatment, he had won great favour with the public. In 1666 he published the first edition of his 'Methodus Curandi Febres,' which was in the main a classified chronological description of all the more important fever cases and cases of diseases allied to fevers that had been treated by him between 1661 and 1664. If Locke knew little of Sydenham before, it cannot be doubted that he made a close study of this book, the modest pioneer of a complete reformation in medicine; and, reading it, he cannot but have been deeply impressed by it. Coming to London in the early summer of 1667, he lost no time in forming, or strengthening, an acquaintance with its author, and from this time till Sydenham's death in 1689, they were as intimate friends as their diverging paths in life permitted. They were well-paired friends.

¹ Wood, 'Athenæ Oxonienses,' vol. iv., col. 270.

² *Ibid.*

³ Latham, vol. i., pp. xxiii., xxvi.

⁴ Wood, 'Fasti Oxonienses,' part ii., col. 270.

Sydenham's influence probably induced Locke, not, it may be, to pay more attention to the study of medicine, but to be more anxious to put his knowledge into practice. Some inducement thereto must have come also from the bare fact of his residence in London, where he could hardly fail to be much more impressed than in a quiet town like Oxford by the terrible amount of curable but uncured disease that was rapidly depopulating the country. Two years before there had come a stupendous tide of the plague, which threatened to turn London into a city of the dead, and swept with varying but always terrible result over nearly the whole of England. Though very little was done, except as an indirect consequence of the next year's great fire, to raise bulwarks of cleanliness and wholesome living, by which the force of another tide of the same sort might be resisted, the plague had returned with much less vehemence in 1666, and seemed almost spent in 1667. Whereas a hundred thousand are reported to have died of it in 1665, the deaths amounted to hardly more than two thousand in the next year, and only thirty-five deaths were reported in the next year to that. The tide left a deposit of disease and disease-begetting pollution behind it, however, which, added to all the other causes of premature death, was certain, unless something were done to avert the evil, to exterminate the people in little more than a few years. Of the inhabitants of London, numbering about five hundred thousand or one-tenth of the whole population of England, nearly sixteen thousand persons died in 1667, whereas the births barely amounted to eleven thousand. That death-rate of three to the hundred, while the birth-rate was only two to the hundred, was all the more alarming as in this year, 1667, only one death out of every four

hundred and fifty was directly caused by the plague. Out of every hundred deaths nearly twenty were due to consumption, nearly thirteen to choleraic symptoms, more than twelve to children's convulsions and teething, nearly eight to small-pox, more than seven to dropsy, nearly six to fever, and only about six to old age.¹

¹ There may be errors in the above calculations, through the incorrect definitions of the "diseases and casualties" given in the official return for the year. The following exact copy of this part of the return may interest some readers. It is taken from "a general bill of all the christenings and burials from 18 December 1666 to 17 December 1667," for the cities of London and Westminster, and the outlying metropolitan parishes in Southwark and the north of London. The document is in the Public Record Office, *Domestic State Papers, Reign of Charles the Second*, sub anno.

Abortive and stillborn	488	Frighted	7
Aged	952	Gout and sciatica	14
Ague	31	Grief	11
Apoplexy	11	Griping in the guts	2108
Bedridden	4	Hanged and made away themselves	9
Bleeding	5	Headache	1
Bloody-flux and flux	94	Jaundice	74
Burnt and scalded	7	"Jawfallen"	2
Calenture	2	Imposthume	90
Cancer, gangrene, and fistula	65	Infants	411
Canker and thrush	90	Killed by several accidents	63
Childbed	262	King's evil	38
"Chisomes"	490	Lethargy	4
Cold, cough, and hiccough	45	"Livergrown"	15
Colic and wind	54	Lunatic	14
Consumption and phthisis	3087	Megrim	4
Convulsions	1210	Measles	83
Cut of the stone and stone	34	Murdered	4
Distracted	2	Overlaid	40
Dropsy and tympany	1134	Palsy	25
Drowned	72	Piles	1
Executed	9	Plague	35
Falling sickness	4	"Plannet"	2
Fever	916	Pleurisy	14
"Flox" and smallpox	1196	Poisoned	4
Found dead in the streets, etc.	10	Quinsy	14
French pox	65	Rickets	202

This dreadful mortality—for which 1667 was only a fairly representative year, and London only a fairly representative part of England—was partly due, of course, to bad drainage, bad ventilation, lack of cleanliness, and contempt of all the other laws of health; but much was chargeable to the ignorance and perversity of the great majority of the physicians who undertook to cure men of their ailments. In spite of Hippocrates and a long series of able teachers during the twenty centuries subsequent to his age, in spite of the reformation led by the Arabian students of science, of the later reformation inaugurated by Galen, and of the still later reformation now being wrought out under the inspiration of Harvey's discovery of the circulation of the blood, medical science was clogged with rival and unreal theories, and medical art was prac-

Rising of the lights	309	Stopping of the stomach	202
Rupture	19	Strangling	12
Scouring	55	Suddenly	36
Scurvy	39	Surfeit	417
Smothered and stifled	3	Swine-pox	3
Sores, ulcers, broken and bruised		Teeth	812
limbs	50	Vomiting	38
Spleen	10	Wen	1
Spotted fever and purples	96	Worms	102
Starved	2	Wounded	7

*Christened.**Buried.*

Males	5616	Males	8223
Females	5322	Females	7619
	<hr/>		<hr/>
In all	10938	In all	15842

The return for the year ending 22nd December, 1670, was still more alarming, as against 11,997 christenings there were 21,198 burials; and the number of deaths from the principal maladies were as follows: griping in the guts, 3690; consumption, 3272; ague and fever, 1729; "flox" and small-pox, 1465.

tised in servile obedience to conflicting and unproved and often unproveable dogmas, modified only by the narrow and shallow experience of monkish apothecaries and more or less foolish wise-women. Great anatomists and great physiologists had risen up, but not much had been done to apply their as yet crude discoveries and their still hazy generalisations to the advantageous detection and remedy of diseases. Botany and chemistry were old sciences in name, but the apothecaries who worked up their products were not generally men of science, and their drugs, even if wisely intended, were as a rule so incorrectly compounded that what was meant to cure was very apt to kill. The idea that every malady was a possession of the devil was still a common one, and the salves and potions were designed rather to ward off or to exorcise a malignant spirit than to eradicate a vicious humour or to quicken the laggard operations of nature. All this turmoil and complication of ignorance and ignorant arrogance tended to make medicine very useless and medical men very contemptible. There were of course at this time, as before and after, in England and elsewhere, many excellent physicians—men like Dr. Willis, of Oxford, and Dr. Thomas Cox, of London—but they were single men in a crowd; and the rest of the crowd were satisfied with obsolete and worthless notions.

It was from this state of things that Sydenham, by his own practice, and by the publication of his experience in successful work, sought as far as he could to rescue society; and Locke, within narrower limits, but with a more philosophical mind, followed the example of his friend. "I have the happiness of curing my patients," wrote Sydenham to Boyle, in 1668, with pardonable pride; "at least, of having it said concerning me that few miscarry under

me; but cannot brag of my correspondency with some of my faculty, who impeach me of great insufficiency; though yet, in taking fire at my attempts to reduce practice to a greater easiness and plainness, and in the meantime letting the mountebank at Charing Cross pass unrailed at, they contradict themselves, and would make the world believe I may prove more considerable than they would have me." "I perceive my friend Mr. Locke," he added, "hath troubled you with an account of my practice, as he hath done himself in visiting with me very many of my variolous patients especially."¹

It is clear from that too brief statement that Locke was in the habit, when he had time, of accompanying Sydenham on his medical visits, especially to variolous or small-pox patients.

Small-pox, one of the most rife and most intractable of diseases at that time, was one to which Sydenham paid special attention, and in respect of which he adopted a mode of treatment then altogether novel, though since his time, and under his guidance, it has come to be almost universally followed. This mode of treatment was part only of the whole system of medical practice to which Sydenham referred when, dedicating the third edition of his 'Methodus Curandi Febres' to Mapletoft in 1676, he said: "You know how thoroughly my method is approved of by an intimate and common friend of ours, and one who has closely and exhaustively examined the subject—I mean Mr. John Locke, a man whom, in the acuteness of his intellect, in the steadiness of his judgment, and in the simplicity, that is, in the excellence, of his manners, I confidently declare to have amongst the men of our own time few equals and no superior."

¹ Boyle, 'Works,' vol. v., p. 465; Sydenham to Boyle, 2 April, 1668.

Being in the dark as to the amount of practical work that Locke shared with Sydenham, for his own instruction, and not for pecuniary profit, we also know far less than it would be satisfactory to know about the practical work that he did by himself. All the information available, as far as these years are concerned, is furnished by a few sheets of paper which have come down to us, and which are apparently only fragments of the whole collection of medical notes made by him. These notes contain full descriptions of important cases attended by him, of the medicines that he administered, and of their effects. From them some information has been extracted concerning the memorable disease from which Lord Ashley suffered, and which Locke cured as far as it could be cured in 1668, and also concerning the more natural ailments of Lady Dorothy Ashley. Of the other cases thus chronicled, it will be sufficient here to give a very brief list, chiefly with the object of showing both the variety of maladies which we know that Locke felt himself competent to attend, and the amount of time which we know that he gave to them.

He was attending a kitchen-maid of the Ashley household, who was afflicted with dropsy, in September, 1667, and again in January, February, and March, 1667-8, and May and June, 1668. In April and May he prescribed for a hard cough with which one of his cousins, a boy of fourteen, and the son of his uncle, Peter Locke, was troubled; and he cured one young child of inflammatory fever in June, and another of hysterics in November of the same year. He visited a "sturdy youth," laid up with rheumatism, every day between the 28th of August and the 19th of September, when he left him to continue using the medicine he had prescribed for him, and on

the 1st of March, 1668-9, he was able to declare him convalescent. In the same March he treated a girl for fever, besides prescribing for two or three minor maladies; and in May, 1669, he cured a case of angina pectoris. We have no record of any other medical work done by him in 1669; but he had cases of erysipelas and gonorrhœa to deal with in January, 1669-70; one of quartan ague in March; another malady, not specified, with which William Sydenham, apparently the son of his great friend, was afflicted, in the same month; two of dropsy in April and May, 1670; one of inflammatory fever, which he treated nearly every day from the 26th of June till its fatal issue on the 11th of July; a case of disease of the kidneys, and another of stricture, in July; one of colic in August, and one of fever, which occupied him every day from the 19th of August till the 2nd of September, when his patient died.¹

That Locke was at this time paying considerable attention to medical work is evident, not only from these fragments of his notes on cases actually treated by him, but also from the numerous memoirs in connection with the subject which he wrote in these years. Unfortunately the most important of these also exist only in fragments.

Among those which are extant, the only complete one, undated, but probably to be referred to the years 1667 or 1668, is a short paper written in Latin, and entitled, 'Respirationis Usus.'²

Far more valuable than this, however, is what seems to be nearly the whole of the first chapter of a long and

¹ *Additional MSS.*, no. 5714, in the British Museum. The fragments of these medical notes referring to Lord Ashley's case are, as has already been noted, among the *Shaftesbury Papers* in the Record Office.

² *Shaftesbury Papers*, series viii., no. 2.

ambitious work. It so clearly and forcibly indicates the practical view that Locke took of the art and science of medicine, and likewise shows so plainly that he was now applying to the most urgent of physical questions the same criterion of truth and usefulness which he was presently to apply to metaphysical questions in his 'Essay concerning Human Understanding,' that the whole of it must here be quoted. The manuscript bears marks of frequent corrections, and some of the corrections, not supplemented by the alteration of minor words and phrases adapted to the terms originally inserted, render it here and there clumsy in expression and almost ungrammatical. But as it stands it is a capital index to one current of Locke's thoughts when he was thirty-seven years old. It is dated 1669; and is entitled, on the fly-leaf, 'Ars Medica,' and at the top of the first page, 'De Arte Medica.'

"Length of life, with freedom from infirmity and pain, as much as the constitution of our frail composure is capable of, is of so great concernment to mankind that there can scarce be found any greater undertaking than the profession to cure diseases, nor is there any art that so well deserves all the care and industry of its professors to improve it and bring it to perfection, which I doubt not but in many parts and to a great degree it is capable of. He that shall go about to do this shall, no question, deserve the thanks of mankind for so good an intention as the reducing those rules and methods to a certainty, on the practice whereof the care and recovery of sick men depends; but whoever shall think to compass it alone will find himself engaged in a business too large for any one man's comprehension and too great for his own single endeavours. My intention therefore is to propose some few things to the consideration of the learned men of this so useful a faculty, and to excite their mutual assistance to perfect the art and establish a settled certain practice in the cure of sicknesses, that so the large catalogue of yet incurable diseases and the frequent sad events of the rest being every day lessened, the diffidence which some sober men upon serious consideration seem to have of the art itself, and the disrepute which others

industriously labour to bring upon the practice of physic, being by the daily growing success of the physicians removed, the industrious and learned practitioners of physic [may] with more confidence and satisfaction attend their calling, when they could be no longer upbraided with those confessed *opprobria medicorum* which every day yield to the efficacy of their medicines or well-ordered methods.

“ If this were once set about, it would not perhaps be found so impossible a design as it is at first sight imagined ; and the great improvements some parts of medicine have received within this few years give me confidence to believe that it is yet capable of great additions, and that in a way something different from what hitherto seems to have been generally followed by most of those who have been so kind as to propagate the knowledge of physic and leave the rules of practice to posterity, as will appear to any one who shall carefully peruse their writings, wherein yet they have very much obliged posterity. And they are not to be blamed that they did that which is very agreeable to the nature of man’s understanding ; which, not contenting itself to observe the operation of nature and the event of things, is very inquisitive after their cause, and is very restless and unquiet till in those things which it is conversant about it has framed to itself some hypothesis and laid a foundation whereon to establish all its reasonings. If, therefore, the learned men of former ages employed a great part of their time and thoughts in searching out the hidden causes of distempers, were curious in imagining the secret workmanship of nature and the several imperceptible tools wherewith she wrought, and, putting all these fancies together, fashioned to themselves systems and hypotheses, ’tis no more to be wondered at or censured that they accommodated themselves to the fashion of their times and countries, and so far complied with their most natural inclinations as to desire to have some basis to rest their thoughts upon, and some grounds to guide them in the practice of their art. Their being busy and subtile in disputing upon allowed principles was but to be employed in the way of fame and reputation and the learning valued in that age ; and that their practice extended no farther than the sacred principles they believed in would permit, is no more to be admired than that we find no fair and lasting fabrics left to us by our ancestors upon narrow and unsound foundations.

“ I would not be thought here to censure the learned authors of former times, or disown the advantages they have left to posterity. To them we owe a great number of excellent observations and several ingenious discourses, and there is not any one rule of practice founded upon unbiassed

observation which I do not receive and submit to with veneration and acknowledgment; yet I think I may confidently affirm that the hypothesis which tied the long and elaborate discourses of the ancients, and suffered not their enquiries to extend themselves any farther than how the phenomena of diseases might be explained by those doctrines and the rules of practice accommodated to the received principles, has at last but confined and narrowed men's thoughts, amused their understanding with fine but useless speculations, and diverted their enquiries from the true and advantageous knowledge of things. The notions that have been raised into men's heads by remote speculative principles, though true, are like the curious imagery men sometimes see in the clouds, which they are pleased to call the heavens, which, though they are for the most part fantastical and at best but the accidental contexture of a mist, yet do really hinder the sight and shadow the prospect; and though these painted apparitions are raised by the sun, and seem the genuine offspring of the great fountain of light, yet they are really nothing but darkness and a cloud; and whosoever shall travel with his eye fixed on these, 'tis ten to one goes out of his way. He that in physic shall lay down fundamental maxims, and, from thence drawing consequences and raising disputes, shall reduce it into the regular form of a science, has indeed done something to enlarge the art of talking and perhaps laid a foundation for endless disputes; but, if he hopes to bring men by such a system to the knowledge of the infirmities [of men's] bodies, the constitution, nature, signs, changes and history of diseases, with the safe and discreet way of their cure, takes much what a like course with him that should walk up and down in a thick wood, overgrown with briars and thorns, with a design to take a view and draw a map of the country. These speculative theorems do as little advantage the physic as food of men, and he that thinks he came to be skilled in diseases by studying the doctrine of the humours, that the notions of obstruction and putrefaction assist him in the cure of fevers, or that by the acquaintance he has with sulphur and mercury he was led into this useful discovery that what medicines and regimen are as certain to kill the latter end of some fevers as they cure in others, may as rationally believe that his cook owes his skill in roasting and boiling to his study of the elements, and that his speculations about fire and water have taught him that the same seething liquor that boils the egg hard makes the hen tender.

“The beginning and improvement of useful arts, and the assistances of human life, have all sprung from industry and observation. True knowledge grew first in the world by experience and rational operations, and, had this

method been continued, and all men's thoughts been employed to add their own trials to the observation of others, no question physic, as well as many other arts, had been in a far better condition than now it is ; but proud man, not content with that knowledge he was capable of and was useful to him, would needs penetrate into the hidden causes of things, lay down principles and establish maxims to himself about the operations of nature, and then vainly expect that nature, or in truth God himself, should proceed according to those laws his maxims had prescribed him ; whereas his narrow, weak faculties could reach no farther than the observation and memory of some few effects produced by visible and external causes, but in a way utterly out of the reach of his apprehension, it being perhaps no absurdity to think that this great and curious fabric of the world, the workmanship of the Almighty, cannot be perfectly comprehended by any understanding but his that made it. Man, still affecting something of a deity, laboured to make his imagination supply what his observation failed him in ; and when he could not discover the principles and causes and methods of nature's workmanship, he would needs fashion all those out of his own thought, and make a world to himself, framed and governed by his own intelligence. This vanity spread itself into many useful parts of natural philosophy, and, by how much the more it seemed subtile, sublime, or learned, by so much the more it proved pernicious and hurtful by hindering the growth of practical knowledge. Thus the most acute and ingenious part of men being by custom and education engaged in empty speculations, the improvement of useful arts was left to the meaner sort of people, who had weaker parts and less opportunities to do it, and were therefore branded with the disgraceful name of mechanics. Hence it came to pass that the world was so filled with books and disputes ; books multiplied without the increase of knowledge ; the ages successively grew more learned without being wiser or happier, or, if the conveniences of human life chanced to be promoted by any new invention, men were not led to such happy discoveries by the conduct of philosophical speculations, but chance or well-designed experiments taught them to those who employed their time and thoughts about the works of nature more than the maxims of the schools.

“ Of this the ploughman, tanner, smith, baker, etc., are witnesses. The great inventions of powder and the loadstone, which have altered the whole affairs of mankind, are undeniable instances ; so that those who had read and writ whole volumes of generation and corruption knew not the way to preserve or propagate the meanest species of creatures ; he that could dispute learnedly of nutrition, concoction and assimilation, was beholding

yet to the cook and the good housewife for a wholesome and savoury meal ; and whoever desired to have fair gardens and fruitful fields had more reason to consult the experience of the dull ploughman and unread gardener than the profound philosopher or acute disputant. Let not any one be offended that I rank the cook and the farmer with the scholar and philosopher ; for, speaking here of the knowledge of natural bodies, the end and benefit whereof can be no other than the advantages and conveniences of human life, all speculations in this subject, however curious or refined, or seeming profound and solid, if they teach not their followers to do something either better or in a shorter and easier way than otherwise they could, or else lead them to the discovery of some new and useful invention, deserve not the name of knowledge, or so much as the waste time of our idle hours to be thrown away upon such empty, idle philosophy. They that are studiously busy in the cultivating and adorning such dry barren notions are vigorously employed to little purpose, and might with as much reason have retrimmed, now they are men, the babies they made when they were children, as exchanged them for those empty impracticable notions that are but the puppets of men's fancies and imaginations, which, however dressed up, are, after forty years' dandling, but puppets still, void of strength, use, or activity.

“ But, not to expatiate into the large field of natural philosophy, where perhaps the foundation of the mischief was first laid, I shall, according to my design, confine myself at present to that branch of it which immediately concerns the health of men ; and, in physic, shall consider—

“ 1. The present state of the faculty of medicine as it now stands, in reference to diseases and their cure.

“ 2. The several degrees and steps whereby it grew to that height it is at present arrived to, which I suppose are these following—(1) experience ; (2) method, founded upon philosophy and hypothesis ; (3) botanics ; (4) chymistry ; (5) anatomy ; in all which I shall endeavour to show how much each hath contributed to the advancing the art of physic, and wherein they came short of perfecting it.

“ 3. What yet may be further done towards the more speedy and certain cure of diseases ; *i.e.*, by what means and method the practice of physic may be brought nearer to perfection.

“ I. Diseases, as they lie under the regimen of physic, and receive more or less check from the applications and methods of that art as it now stands, may fitly be divided into four sorts :

“ 1. Such as are almost perfectly under the control of medicine, and do for the most part constantly yield to the skilful physician's hand, guided by

the established rules of his art, and wherein he can at first sight, as far as is fit with submission to Providence and the great Disposer of men's lives, undertake the cure with assurance of a happy event; for it is not to be hoped that the meanest disease should always obey the skill of the ablest physician; nor would such a vanity be tolerable in weak, ignorant men, to pretend to be the disposers of health and life, that are the free gifts of Almighty God, which though his hand uncontrollably takes away or bestows where he pleases, yet he most commonly does it by the intervention of fit secondary means, and therefore I doubt not but a physician in some cases may with as little presumption assure a sick man of recovery as a mother undertake to cure the hunger of her child, which is a disease too; but yet this he doth not by any power or authority of his own over the nature of things, but by a right application of those remedies which were ordained for the producing such effects; medicines, rightly ordered, being as certain to recover some infirm bodies, as rabbits and chicken well dressed, to nourish others that are healthy, though perhaps some constitutions may be found with whom that kind even of wholesome diet will not at all agree. But yet, whoever has brought the cure of any disease near such a certainty as is the nourishment of a healthy man by any one kind of wholesome meat, may be allowed to be confident in his undertaking that species of distemper and in that part to have perfected the art of physic, though perhaps in some stubborn and irregular cases his well-constituted method should fail him, and the disease frustrate the whole success of his endeavours. And to such a degree of perfection as this I think I may confidently affirm the art of physic is arrived in many diseases which seldom stand out against the skilful attempts of good practitioners. Nor let the malice of prejudiced persons suggest here that these confident promises of health are not to be relied [on], but only in such diseases which of themselves leave us, wherein nature commonly works the cure without the assistance of art, and it may be with reason suspected the patient owed his recovery more to the vigour of his own constitution than the apothecary's drugs. Some diseases, like some weeds"¹

There, in the middle of a sentence, Locke's treatise 'De Arte Medica,' breaks off; and, as it also breaks off in the middle of a page, it seems reasonable to infer that he wrote no more. It was doubtless begun, like nearly everything else that he wrote, mainly as an exercise for

¹ *Shaftesbury Papers*, series viii., no. 2.

himself, and with no thought, or only a very vague thought, about its future publication. As it stands, however, the fragment is so clear that it needs no commentary.

Another fragment of Locke's, nearly twice as long as the one that has just been quoted, touches on one of the subjects there proposed for treatment. It is dated a year earlier, 1668, and is entitled 'Anatomica.' A sentence, squeezed in at the top of the page in Sydenham's handwriting shows very plainly that what Locke had designed to be the beginning of a separate treatise was, by subsequent arrangement between them, intended to be preceded by some observations written by one or other of them, but now lost. Sydenham's abrupt sentence runs thus: "Others of them have more pompously and speciously prosecuted the promoting of this art by searching into the bowels of dead and living creatures, as well sound as diseased, to find out the seeds of discharging them, but with how little success such endeavours have been and are like to be attended, I shall here in some measure make appear." That is followed by Locke's first sentence: "Anatomy, no question, is absolutely necessary to a surgeon, and to a physician who would direct a surgeon in incision, trepanning, and several other operations." Locke pointed out other cases in which anatomy is useful, if not necessary, to medical practice. Then he propounded what every one now-a-days must regard as a strange heresy for such a man to hold. "But that anatomy," he said, "is like to afford any great improvements to the practice of physic, or assist a man in the finding out and establishing a true method, I have reason to doubt. All that anatomy can do is only to show us the gross and sensible parts of the body, or the vapid and

dead juices, all which, after the most diligent search, will be no more able to direct a physician how to cure a disease than how to make a man ; for, to remedy the defects of a part whose organical constitution, and that texture whereby it operates, he cannot possibly know, is alike hard as to make a part he knows not how is made." Locke supported this extreme view, at some length, by various arguments and instances ; the gist of the whole treatise, as far as we have it, being to prove that anatomy can never show the cause of any disease or the means of its cure ; that it can only show, in a very rough and insufficient way, the actual physical state of the body, whether in health or in disease, at the time of handling ; and that therefore at best it must be a very unsatisfactory tool in the hands of the physician.¹

The arguments in this treatise, if examined one by one, cannot easily be refuted ; but few, and least of all any disciples of Locke, will deny that his view, which Sydenham appears to have shared with him, was very narrow and bigoted. Anatomy, however, it should be remembered, was still almost in its infancy when Locke wrote ; and though it was just then making a great start, destined to lead to excellent results, the start consisted so much in the rough and untutored exercises which found favour with the Royal Society, that Locke had some excuse for being prejudiced, not only against them, but against the good work they were intended to do. Perhaps it was the consciousness that he was overstating his case which caused him to lay aside his fragment on anatomy.

Another fragment, undated, but written certainly while he was at Exeter House, and probably before 1670, is entitled 'Tussis,' and contains the first portion of what

¹ *Shaftesbury Papers*, series viii., no. 2.

was evidently intended to be an elaborate paper on coughs.¹ As Locke began about this time to have a cough that seriously troubled him through the remainder of his life, he may thereby have been induced to make this special study of the malady in its several forms. As the essay contains no personal information, and is altogether technical in its style, it need not here be described. It is, however, worth recording, that in the margin, near the end of the fragment, this note occurs in Sydenham's handwriting: "Here the cures done by riding are to be brought in, in reference to cure of consumptions and morbi obscuri."

It is evident that during these years there was a very close intimacy between Locke and Sydenham. Not only did Locke accompany Sydenham in his visits to patients whose cases required most careful watching, both for the patients' own sakes and also for the useful lessons to be gained thence in the interests of medical science; but Sydenham assisted Locke in his medical practice in the Ashley household. Not only did Sydenham correct and annotate Locke's manuscripts on medical subjects; but Locke in return took a very lively interest and apparently an active part in Sydenham's writings.²

Sydenham's first treatise was published in 1666, before their friendship, if not their acquaintance, began. The

¹ *Shaftesbury Papers*, series viii., no. 2.

² Some account will be hereafter given of the extant portions of a manuscript volume, prepared by Locke in or after the year 1685, and entitled by him 'Extracts of Sydenham's Physic Books, and some good Letters on Various Subjects,' now in the Bodleian Library, and published by Dr. Greenhill in 1845, with the title, 'Anecdota Sydenhamiana,' which gives further evidence of their connection at this time, though the notes were not put together till fifteen or more years later.

second edition of that treatise appeared in 1668, without differing very much from the first edition, but with the to us noteworthy insertion, after the preface, of a Latin poem of fifty-four lines, inscribed, 'In tractatum de Febribus D. D. Sydenham, praxin Medicam apud Londinenses mira solertia aequae ac felicitate exercentis,' and signed 'J. Locke, A.M. ex Aede Christi Oxon.' Fevers spread desolation over the world, Locke in effect said, in not very polished verse, and medicine could not conquer them; physicians as well as other folks fled before them:

"Se tandem Sydenham febrisque scholaeque furori
Opponens, morbi quaerit et artis opem."

And after further presentation of the merits of his friend, Locke ended with a prophecy that has been fulfilled:

"Tu meliora paras, victrix Medicina; tuusque,
Pestis quae superat cuncta, triumphus erit.
Vive, liber, victis febrilibus ignibus; unus
Te simul et mundum qui manet, ignis erit."

Perhaps those complimentary verses were all or nearly all that Locke contributed to the second edition of the 'Methodus Curandi Febres;' but he helped or designed to help Sydenham in other ways. After the 'Methodus' had been written it would seem that Sydenham paid so much further attention to small-pox, that he contemplated writing a book specially on that disease, and for this book Locke prepared part of a preface and a dedication in 1670.

The dedication was addressed to Lord Ashley and, besides affording other interesting information, shows that Locke was aided by Sydenham in attendance on at any rate the small-pox cases which occurred in Lord Ashley's family. "Were I not by long experience," Locke wrote in his friend's name, "confirmed in the

certainty of what I here publish, it would not become me to engage your lordship's name in a controversy which (if I had been as forward by noise and clamour to maintain, as others, by reproaches, false reports, secret and open defamation have been hot to prosecute and decry) had by this time grown into a faction." The dedication then proceeds to condemn the modes of treatment pursued by many medical men, and for which they were praised, even when they killed their patients. "I say not this to undervalue the medicines of other men, but only to let your lordship see how differently it has fared with me, who have undergone so many rebukes and reproaches in the prosecution of a plain and open method, which I never endeavoured, nor indeed could, conceal from any one who had but the curiosity to observe it, and which I think had no fault, unless it be one to be plain and easy and such as poor people may, to the saving of their lives, make use of without the help of a physician." "At least, my lord, I thought it reasonable to let you see that I had practised nothing in your family but what I durst own and publish to the world, and let my countrymen see that I tell them nothing here but what I have already tried with no ill success on several in the family of one of the greatest and most eminent personages amongst them."¹

The long fragment of a preface which Locke wrote for Sydenham was intended to justify the production of this treatise on "the history and cure of a disease which, however but too well know by its terrible aspect and fatal effects to most families in England, yet, as to the true state of the disease and the right method of ordering it, has hitherto lain in obscurity." It offered many ex-

¹ *Shaftesbury Papers*, series viii., no. 2.

cuses for the ignorant and mischievous treatment of small-pox adopted by most other practitioners, and pointed out that Sydenham could easily have made a fortune by killing his patients in the orthodox way, but complained that for curing them by his own method he was everywhere abused and maligned.¹

The treatise on small-pox for which Locke supplied these preludes, whether the notes for it were written out or not in 1670, was not issued then or afterwards, at any rate as a separate work.² Sydenham published nothing after the second edition of the 'Methodus Curandi Febres' in 1668, till 1676, when he incorporated most of his notes and a great deal of fresh matter in the 'Observationes Medicae,' which was substantially a new work. This work was dedicated, not to Lord Ashley, but to Dr. Mapletoft, and Sydenham supplied a preface different from Locke's. Locke was then in France, and the manuscripts from which the foregoing extracts have been made were apparently packed away with his other papers at Exeter House, out of Sydenham's reach.

Sydenham is especially famous for his substitution of cool treatment and generous diet for the stewing and starving system previously and in his day adopted by nearly all other practitioners in dealing with small-pox; he is hardly less famous for his employment of Peruvian bark in the cure of agues, and of laudanum in the cure of dysentery, gout and other maladies. Immensely valuable as those innovations were, however, his greatest service to medical science consisted in his recognition of the great truth that the physician's duty is to aid,

¹ *Shaftesbury Papers*, series viii., no. 2.

² Some of the notes, or copies of them, were retained by Locke. See 'Anecdota Sydenhamiana,' p. 58, etc.

not to thwart, the course of nature. "That practice, and that alone," he wrote, "will bring relief to the sufferer, which elicits the curative indications from the phenomena of the diseases themselves, and confirms them by experience. The improvement of physic in my opinion depends, first, upon collecting as genuine and natural a description or history of diseases as can be procured, and, secondly, upon laying down a fixed and complete method of cure. In writing a natural history of diseases, every merely philosophical hypothesis should be set aside, and the manifest and natural phenomena, however minute, should be noted with the utmost exactness. The usefulness of this procedure cannot be easily overrated; for can there be a shorter way, or indeed any other way, of coming at the causes of disease, or of discovering the curative indications, than by a certain perception of the peculiar symptoms? By these steps and helps it was that the father of physic, the great Hippocrates, came to excel; his theory being no more than an exact description or view of nature. He found that nature alone often terminates diseases, and works a cure with a few simple medicines, and often enough with no medicines at all. If only one person in every age had accurately described and constantly cured but a single disease, and made known his secret, physic would not be where it now is. But we have long since forsaken the ancient method of cure, founded upon the knowledge of conjunct causes, insomuch that the art, as at this day practised, is the art rather of talking about diseases than of curing them. The discovering and assigning of remote causes is an impossible attempt; only immediate and conjunct causes fall within the compass of our knowledge."¹

¹ I have further condensed the above citation from a condensed

Those were the main points in Sydenham's teaching and method for which he had, and felt himself honoured in having, the approval of John Locke.

Long after the period that we are now considering Locke continued to look upon medicine as his proper vocation, and there seems to have been no abatement of the interest taken by him in medical studies and pursuits. But he also took great interest in other matters, and, partly by necessity, partly by choice, these other matters diverted his attention. Had he so chosen, he might, of course, have remained quietly at Oxford until, without asking any favours from the university authorities, he had qualified himself for a doctor's degree, and then he could have settled down, as his friend Sydenham had done, as a regular working physician in London or elsewhere. Fortunately for his own and later generations, however commendable such a course might have been, he did not pursue it. He allowed himself to drift into other occupations, and in each he did so much that posterity has almost forgotten that he was ever a medical man at all.

Thus it occurs that at the very time when he was devoting all the leisure he could spare from Lord Ashley's service to medical studies, medical practice and medical authorship, he was also busily occupied with altogether different work, and work which in 1670 and afterwards absorbed so much of his attention that he was compelled almost to abandon the pursuit of medicine. This change

translation by Dr. John Brown, in his paper on 'Locke and Sydenham,' in 'Horae Subsecivae' (1861), first series, pp. 1-104. This paper contains much interesting information about Sydenham, and some welcome remarks, amid many biographical inaccuracies, about Locke.

was evidently brought about in the first instance by the terms, whatever they were, upon which he entered Lord Ashley's service in 1667; but there can be no doubt that the new duties assigned to him were undertaken and carried on as a labour of love.

More than eighty years before, Sir Walter Raleigh and his brother adventurers had made the first bold English attempt to rival the Spaniards in their planting of colonies in America; and, though Raleigh's Virginia failed dismally, his example encouraged others to enter on the work with better result. The puritan colonies had been founded further north in the American continent, a smaller Virginia had begun to grow in the upper portion of the territory assigned to Raleigh by Queen Elizabeth, and some prosperous settlements had been made in the West Indies, though these were still rather the haunts of pirates than the homes of planters, before any serious plans were laid for occupying the district that had especially tempted Raleigh by its rich fertility and luxuriant beauty. In 1663, however, all earlier patents being revoked, this district, now known as Carolina, was given by Charles the Second to eight "lords proprietors," Lord Chancellor Clarendon, the Duke of Albemarle, Lord Craven, Lord Berkeley, Lord Ashley, Sir George Carteret, Sir William Berkeley, and Sir John Colleton.¹ Of these patentees Ashley was the most active and influential; and thus it happened that Locke, being Ashley's principal adviser and assistant, became in some sort of irregular way the chief secretary or manager of the whole company of lords proprietors of Carolina. His conduct in this new position shows something more than the versatility of his talents and the superabundance of his energy.

¹ *Shaftesbury Papers*, series ix., no. 1*.

A little had been done, without much prudence, before Locke became interested in the matter; but the real work began in April, 1669, when the proprietors undertook to contribute 500*l.* a piece towards the fitting out of an expedition, and steps were immediately taken for putting the money to good use. All was ready by the 10th of August, when the good ship *Carolina*, with eighty-six men and six women on board, including officers, crew, and passengers, started for the new colony, along with a smaller craft, the *Port Royal*, and a little sloop, the *Albemarle*, as to the number of whose officers, crews, and passengers we are not informed. The *Carolina* cost 930*l.* 17*s.* 11*d.*, the *Port Royal* 199*l.* 5*s.* 8*d.*, and the *Albemarle* 82*l.* 1*s.* 10*d.*;¹ and the entire charges for fitting out these vessels, including the wages of the seamen, made a total of 3200*l.* 16*s.* 6*d.* for the whole preliminary expense of this first English expedition in aid of the stragglers and small groups of emigrants from other colonies who had begun to take irregular possession of some corners of the province.² The expedition seems small when compared with the exploits of more recent times. But it was a great one for that day, and no little labour and good management were required in buying and fitting out the ships, and in getting them afloat, between the end of April and the middle of August. Those were busy

¹ *Shaftesbury Papers*, series ix., no. 4*****.

² *Ibid.*, series ix., no. 4*****. As an illustration of the way in which, two hundred years ago, a new colony was fitted out, the value of the different items composing the cargo of these three vessels may here be given:—Provisions, 540*l.* 11*s.* 8*d.*; clothing, 2*l.* 12*s.* 4*d.*; gunpowder and munitions of war, 397*l.* 15*s.*; tools and other iron ware, 188*l.* 9*s.* 7*d.*; casks, 87*l.* 0*s.* 1*d.*; fishing tackle, 28*l.* 10*s.*; beads and other articles for trading with the Indians, 50*l.* 18*s.* 8*d.*; and surgical instruments and medicines, 30*l.*

months for all who had the management of the enterprise ; and, Exeter House being its head-quarters, and Locke its principal superintendent, there can be no doubt that he had plenty of work on his hands that summer.

To him, moreover, was specially assigned a much more delicate, and doubtless a much more congenial, task than the superintendence of this business. No young colony can thrive without adequate supplies of food, clothing, and the like ; and many hopeful ventures failed in old times for lack of these. But quite as frequent a cause of failure was bad government, amid a profusion of material resources ; and good government is a harder thing to provide than money and provisions. Wonderful pains were taken to provide good government for Carolina, and perhaps no colony was ever started with a more elaborate scheme of political, social, and religious organisation. Locke had a large share in this work, though there can hardly be any doubt that it was initiated by Lord Ashley, and modified by his fellow-proprietors. The scheme that was produced agrees entirely with all we know of Lord Ashley's theoretical opinions, and his notion of the ways in which they should be put into practice, while some of those opinions are distinctly at variance with the views which Locke had already expressed in his 'Essay concerning Toleration' and his 'Reflections upon the Roman Commonwealth,' and which he long afterwards expressed in almost identical terms in his published writings. There is such close resemblance, however, between some of its provisions and some of the views which Locke had set on record before his acquaintance with Lord Ashley began, that he must certainly have had a share, not only in its detailed working out, but also in its original concoction. We may safely assume, accordingly, that it

grew out of conferences in which Locke took part in his undefined capacity of secretary, and that to him was entrusted the task of setting forth the results of those conferences in orderly and intelligible shape, without power of altering the conditions that had already been agreed upon.¹

The scheme was set forth in 'The Fundamental Constitutions for the Government of Carolina,' of which there is extant a draft in Locke's handwriting, dated the 21st of June, 669, and which, with some alterations, were

¹ The original draft, a small vellum-covered volume of seventy-five pages, neatly written, but with numerous erasures and corrections, is preserved among the *Shaftesbury Papers* (series viii. no. 3), and this interesting document has been printed, *verbatim et literatim*, by Mr. W. Noel Sainsbury, in the appendix to the Thirty-third Report of the Deputy Keeper of the Public Records (1872), pp. 258—269. The text, as adopted by the lords proprietors, is given in the later editions of Locke's 'Works,' and was first printed "from Mr. Locke's copy, wherein are several amendments made with his own hand," in 'A Collection of Several Pieces of Mr. John Locke' (1720), by Des Maizeaux, who says in his dedication, "He had presented it, as a work of his, to one of his friends, who was pleased to communicate it to me." On this authority, Locke has often been stated to be the author of the 'Constitutions.' In the same collection, however, Des Maizeaux printed, with a circumstantial statement as to Locke's authorship of it, a work which, as will be shown hereafter, Locke did not write. His mere assertion, therefore, is of no value; and there appear to me to be conclusive reasons against attributing to Locke any larger share in the composition of the 'Constitutions' than I have indicated above. It is incredible that a man of such inventive powers and arbitrary disposition as Lord Ashley should, however highly he may have valued Locke's judgment, have done more than take suggestions from him, to be followed or rejected as he thought fit. It is even more incredible that Locke, truthful and modest as he was, so anxious to avoid committing himself to any opinions of whose correctness he was not thoroughly satisfied that he refused to publish anything till he was fifty three years old, should either have abandoned his own convictions to return to them again afterwards, or have undertaken the task of projecting a whole scheme of government at this early stage of his political life.

issued by the proprietors on the 1st of March, 1669-70. It attempted to adapt to the circumstances and exigencies of the new colony a comprehensive and overwhelming system of feudal government, tempered, however, by a remarkable liberality in religious affairs. It is in the latter respect only that we have any means of estimating the extent of Locke's share in the projecting of these 'Constitutions,' apart from his proper business as a draughtsman; and therefore it will suffice to call attention to the clauses by which a large measure of religious liberty was secured for Carolina.

"No man," it is stipulated in the first of these clauses, "shall be permitted to be a freeman of Carolina, or to have any estate or habitation within it, that doth not acknowledge a God, and that God is publicly to be worshipped."¹ Whether Locke initiated that rule, we have no means of knowing; but his views expressed elsewhere clearly show that he agreed with it. The next clause, however, we are told, "was not drawn up by Mr. Locke, but inserted by some of the chief of the proprietors, against his judgment, as Mr. Locke himself informed one of his friends."² "As the country comes to be sufficiently planted and distributed into fit divisions," it was there appointed, "it shall belong to the parliament to take care for the building of churches and the public maintenance of divines, to be employed in the exercise of religion according to the church of England, which, being the only true and orthodox and the national religion of the king's dominions, is also of Carolina, and therefore it alone shall be allowed to receive public maintenance by

¹ Article xcv. of the printed version. The numberings in Locke's draft were different.

² 'A Collection of several Pieces of Mr. John Locke,' p. 42.

grant of parliament.”¹ By comparing that clause with those that follow, we shall be able to measure their liberality—such liberality as few men besides Locke, in his day, would have been likely to advocate.

“But since the natives of that place, who will be concerned in our plantations, are utterly strangers to Christianity, whose idolatry, ignorance or mistake gives us no right to expel or use them ill, and those who remove from other parts to plant there will unavoidably be of different opinions concerning matters of religion, the liberty whereof they will expect to have allowed them, and it will not be reasonable for us on this account to keep them out—that civil peace may be maintained amidst the diversity of opinions, and our agreement and compact with all men may be duly and faithfully observed, the violation whereof, upon what pretence soever, cannot be without great offence to Almighty God and great scandal to the true religion that we profess—and also that heathens, Jews, and other dissenters from the purity of Christian religion may not be scared and kept at a distance from it, but, by having an opportunity of acquainting themselves with the truth and reasonableness of its doctrines and the peaceableness and inoffensiveness of its professors, may, by good usage and persuasion and all those convincing methods of gentleness and meekness suitable to the rules and designs of the gospel, be won over to embrace and unfeignedly receive the truth; therefore any seven or more persons, agreeing in any religion, shall constitute a church or profession to which they shall give some name to distinguish it from others.

“The terms of admittance and communion with any church or profession shall be written in a book, and therein be subscribed by all the members of the said church or profession.

“The time of every one’s subscription and admittance shall be dated in the said book or record.

“In the terms of communion of every church or profession these following shall be three (without which no agreement or assembly of men, upon pretence of religion, shall be accounted a church or profession within these rules) 1. ‘That there is a God;’ 2. ‘That God is publicly to be worshipped;’ 3. ‘That it is lawful, and the duty of every man, being thereunto called by those that govern, to bear witness to that truth;’ and that every church or profession shall, in their terms of communion, set down the external way whereby they witness a truth as in the presence of God, whether it be by

¹ Article xcvi.

laying hands on or kissing the Bible, as in the protestant and papist churches,¹ or by holding up the hand, or any other sensible way.

“No person above seventeen years of age shall have any benefit or protection of the law, or be capable of any place of profit or honour, who is not a member of some church or profession, having his name recorded in some one and but one religious record at once.

“No person whatsoever shall speak anything in their religious assembly irreverently or seditiously of the government, or governors, or state matters.

“Any person subscribing the terms of communion of any church or profession in the record of the said church, before the precinct registrar and any five members of the church or profession, shall be thereby made a member of the said church or profession.

“Any person striking his own name out of any religious record, or his name being struck out by any officer thereunto authorised by each church or profession, respectively, shall cease to be a member of that church or profession.

“No person shall use any reproachful, reviling, or abusive language against the religion of any church or profession, that being the certain way of disturbing the public peace, and of hindering the conversion of any to the truth, by engaging them in quarrels and animosities, to the hatred of the professors and that profession which otherwise they might be brought to assent to.

“Since charity obliges us to wish well to the souls of all men, and religion ought to alter nothing in any man's civil estate or right, it shall be lawful for slaves, as well as others, to enter themselves and be of what church or profession any of them shall think best, and thereof be as fully members as any freemen; but yet no slave shall thereby be exempted from that civil dominion his master hath over him, but be in all other things in the same state and condition he was in before.

“Assemblies upon what pretence soever of religion, not observing and performing the above said rules, shall be esteemed not as churches, but unlawful meetings, and be punished as other riots.

“No person whatsoever shall disturb, molest, or persecute another for his speculative opinions in religion or his way of worship.”

¹ In the corrected copy of the ‘Constitutions,’ “as in the church of England” was substituted for the last phrase.

² Articles xcvi.—ci., ciii., civ., cviii., cix.

Whether Locke originated those generous arrangements or not, he was certainly responsible for the wording of them, in which the generosity was clearly expressed; and it is strange that either he or Lord Ashley, who agreed with him in this matter; should have been able to persuade the other proprietors of Carolina to accede to such provisions. You must believe in God and consent to worship him, and you must make no secret of your belief, or your form of worship, if you want to settle in Carolina, they said in effect to all would-be emigrants; but that is all we require of you. Any seven or more of you may adopt any sort of notion about God, and any plan for worshipping him, that commend themselves to your judgments, provided of course that the freedom claimed by you does not interfere with the freedom of other persons; and not only shall you be allowed to hold your beliefs and opinions without any restraint, but you shall also be protected by the state from all sorts of interference with you in doing so.

No other colony, English or foreign, was ever started with such guarantees for "liberty of conscience," and it is well to remember that, long after the 'Fundamental Constitutions of Carolina' had been formally abrogated, the moral authority of these guarantees remained in force, and that, in consequence of them, Carolina became a much freer asylum for religious outcasts from Europe than either Massachusetts or Pennsylvania.

The political and territorial arrangements of the 'Constitutions' never actually came into operation. Issued first in 1670, they were reissued, with some modifications, in 1682, and again, with more important modifications, in 1698. But the real institutions of the colony were home-grown and developed out of experience, and the supre-

macy of the lords proprietors was virtually repudiated long before Carolina, by this time divided into two prosperous communities, became part of the United States.

Locke's connection with the affairs of the colony lasted only through its earliest infancy; but for the first few years, until he was called off to other occupations, his influence in its detailed management seems to have been almost paramount, and the zeal shown by him in endeavouring to secure the prosperity of the settlement was amazing. Down to the autumn of 1672 he continued his informal, but onerous, office of secretary to the proprietors, and the documents that are extant throw much light on his occupations at this time. Nearly every letter received from the colony is docketed by him, and of a great number of letters that have disappeared there exist careful epitomes in his handwriting. We have also drafts, entered by him, of numerous letters sent out from England, and his hand is plainly shown in other letters.¹ Out of these materials it would be easy to construct almost the entire history of the colony during the first years of its existence; but such a history would here be out of place.

One illustration of the ways in which he was employed in connection with this new enterprise may be given. In 1671, Sir Peter Colleton, whose brother was one of the proprietors of Carolina, and afterwards a useful friend to Locke, thus wrote to him: "Mr. Ogilby, who is printing a relation of the West Indies, hath been often with me to get a map of Carolina; wherefore I humbly desire you to get of my lord those maps of Cape Fear and Albemarle that he hath, and I will draw them into one; and if you

¹ *Shaftesbury Papers*, series ix., *passim*.

would do us the favour to draw a discourse to be added to this map in the nature of a description, such as might invite people without seeming to come from us, it would very much conduce to the speedy settlement.”¹ Locke does not appear to have complied with this request, though he evidently made preparations for doing so. On the blank portions of Sir Peter Colleton’s letter he drew up a long list of books to be consulted on the subject, including nearly every work that had been written about the West Indies, from Herrera and Peter Martyr downwards, together with a string of heads for apparently a much more elaborate treatise than his friend had asked for. This string of heads was as follows: “Situation; Discovery; Soil and Shore; Subterranean Fossilia; Air and Temperature; Water, Rivers, Lakes; Fish; Plants and Fruits; Insects; Birds; Beasts; Inhabitants—Number, Bodies, Abilities of Mind, Temper and Inclinations, Morality and Customs, Religion, Economy.”

Of Locke’s miscellaneous occupations and pursuits, and the more personal incidents and connections of his life, between 1667 and 1672, only stray and fragmentary information has come down to us.

On the 19th of November, 1668, he was proposed, and on the 23rd he was elected, a fellow of the Royal Society, his proposer being Sir Paul Neil, a friend of Boyle’s, and also, apparently, of Lord Ashley’s, and one of the most energetic members of the society from the time of its incorporation in 1663.² His association with this body,

¹ *Shaftesbury Papers*, series ix., no. 17; Sir Peter Colleton to Locke, Thursday [1671].

² Birch, ‘History of the Royal Society’ (1756), vol. ii., p. 323.

containing in 1668 more than two hundred members, among whom were many of the ablest and most zealous thinkers and scientific workers of the day, probably brought him some new friends; but he appears to have taken very little part in its deliberations, although several efforts were made, by investing him with offices of trust connected with it, to secure his active and prominent support. On the 11th of February, 1668-9, for instance, barely ten weeks after his election, he was chosen one of a special committee of eleven, appointed "for considering and directing experiments;"¹ but there is nothing to show that he ever engaged in this business. On the 30th of November, 1669, again, he was elected a member of the council; but the only meeting that he attended was held on the 26th of July following,² and after that we find no mention of him in the records of the society for more than two years.

The Royal Society, even from its very beginning, did work too useful in itself, and too suggestive of better work to be done by others, to deserve all the banter that was heaped upon it by the author of 'Hudibras,' but there was some justification for Butler's ridicule of the enthusiastic frivolity and unscientific credulity with which some of its fellows attempted all at once to solve every mystery in the universe, and a good many mysteries of their own making.

" What is't that makes all fountains still
 Within the earth to run up hill,
 But on the outside down again,
 As if th' attempt had been in vain?
 Or what's the strange magnetic cause,
 The steel on loadstone's drawn or draws?"

¹ Birch, vol. ii., p. 346.

² *Ibid.*, vol. ii., pp. 406, 446.

Whether the north-star's influence
 With both does hold intelligence ?
 Or whether male and female screws
 In th' iron and stone th' effect produce ?
 What makes the body of the sun,
 That such a rapid course does run,
 To draw no tail behind through th' air,
 As comets do, when they appear ?
 Whether the sea increase or waste,
 And, if it do, how long 'twill last ?
 Or, if the sun approaches near
 The earth, how soon it will be there ?
 These were their learned speculations,
 And all their constant occupations ;
 To measure wind, and weigh the air,
 And turn a circle to a square ;
 To make a powder of the sun,
 By which all doctors should be undone ;
 To find the north-west passage out,
 Although the farthest way about ;
 To stew th' elixir in a bath
 Of hope, credulity, and faith ;
 To explicate by subtle hints
 The grain of diamonds and flints ;
 And in the braying of an ass
 Find out the treble and the bass."¹

In formally connecting himself with the society, Locke showed that he approved, in the main, of its proceedings—as he could not have failed to do ; but he evidently preferred for himself the quieter and more systematic studies appropriate to the branches of science on which he was best informed, and in which his experiments and observations were most likely to be useful. He found

¹ Butler, 'Satire upon the Royal Society,' ll. 49—54, 57—66, 81—92, 97—102.

more advantage to himself and others in less obtrusive gatherings of a few chosen friends.

It was at the meetings of such a little club or debating society that, according to his own report, the 'Essay concerning Human Understanding' was started. "Five or six friends, meeting at my chamber, and discoursing on a subject very remote from this," he says, "found themselves quickly at a stand by the difficulties that rose on every side. After we had awhile puzzled ourselves without coming any nearer a resolution of those doubts which perplexed us, it came into my thoughts that we took a wrong course, and that, before we set ourselves upon inquiries of that nature, it was necessary to examine our own abilities, and see what objects our understandings were or were not fitted to deal with. This I proposed to the company, who all readily assented, and thereupon it was agreed that this should be our first inquiry. Some hasty and undigested thoughts on a subject I had never before considered, which I set down against our next meeting, gave the first entrance into this discourse."¹

Of the other members of this very memorable little debating society, which met from time to time in Locke's chamber in Exeter House, we only know the names of two, James Tyrrell and David Thomas;² and all our information as to the nature of its deliberations is contained in a vague indication of the special subject which Locke said he had "never before considered," and which led to the ultimate elaboration of thoughts that were anything but "hasty and undigested." "I remember being myself one of those that met there," wrote Tyrrell,

¹ 'Concerning Human Understanding,' (1690), Epistle to the Reader.

² MSS. in the *Remonstrants' Library*; Lady Masham to Le Clerc, 12 Jan., 1704-5: Le Clerc, 'Eloge de M. Locke' in the 'Bibliothèque Choisie.'

“when the discourse began about the principles of morality and revealed religion.”¹ That scanty information, however, is sufficiently suggestive, and helps us to understand something of Locke’s occupations in such intervals as he could gain from his varied and onerous employments as physician, tutor and family adviser in Lord Ashley’s household, as medical practitioner and author, and as chief assistant in the foundation of the colony of Carolina.

The particular and momentous discussion from which the ‘Essay concerning Human Understanding’ immediately resulted probably took place in the winter of 1670-1.² But we may assume that similar discussions were held in the years before and after.

Locke’s intercourse with Thomas, Tyrrell, and his other intimate friends, was not limited to serious argument on abstruse points in ethics and metaphysics, theology and religion.

Thomas had left Oxford, and, though often in London, had settled down as a doctor in Salisbury, his native town, and there Locke paid him a visit on his way back to London from Lord Ashley’s Dorsetshire house in the early autumn of 1669, apparently in company with his newly married pupil, Anthony Ashley. “I am glad you are returned to town,” Thomas wrote soon afterwards, “and wish well to Mr. Ashley. I would desire the favour of your company again in a month or two, and so would Parthenice,—about which time, I believe, we shall be

¹ A marginal note in Tyrrell’s handwriting, in his copy of the first edition of the ‘Essay,’ now in the British Museum.

² Lady Masham says, “in the year 1670 or 1671;” Tyrrell, writing from memory more than twenty years after the occurrence, and probably in confusion as to the date, says, “in the winter of 1673.”

married. Pray give me some advice concerning wedding clothes and the fashions. I intend to buy two suits, one for riding, the other to be fine in on that day. I know not what to say to your gelding; but if you keep him a little while till I can see him, I will give you my resolution." Who Parthenice, Thomas's intended bride, was—whether Locke, having just found a wife for one friend, looked up the fashions and chose the wedding clothes for another—and whether he sold his horse on fair terms—are matters concerning which we have no records; but the postscript to Thomas's letter shows that his matrimonial projects, and the new purchases incident to them, had not driven medical questions out of his head. "Pray let me know," he added, "whether the griping of the guts of which so many die in London, and are sick in the country, be cholera morbus, and what way of cure Sydenham uses. My humble service to him."¹

Thomas's marriage, whenever it took place, must have been postponed. Next month he wrote a letter full of nothing but allusions to chemical experiments and inquiries about drugs, except that it makes a reference to Locke's talked-of visit to Salisbury—only, however, in allusion to their joint chemical pursuits,—and that it again mentions the young lady with the classical nickname. "If you were here, or could spend this winter a fortnight or three weeks in Sarum, we might, it may be, perform some good operations," is the sentence about chemical experiments. The other runs thus: "Parthenice is as well as ever I saw her; she presents her service to you."²

We are just now in a small nest of mysteries, and the

¹ *Shaftesbury Papers*, series viii., no. 2; Thomas to Locke, 19 Oct., 1669.

² *Ibid.*, series viii., no. 2; Thomas to Locke, Nov., 1669.

one or two next to be referred to show us how little we know about some important phases of Locke's life.

Among other fragments of his correspondence there is a half-sheet of paper, which evidently contains in part the draft of a letter to be sent to some intimate friend. Whenever he wrote carefully, Locke wrote well and in a handwriting with an unmistakable character of its own; but this is scribbled off in the cramped-up writing that he adopted in his private memoranda. It is endorsed "J. Lo. to Dor., '69." Though it is not quite intelligible, it furnishes such curious illustration of Locke's temperament that the whole fragment claims to be printed as it stands.

"Have your sighs the virtue to blow away others' tears, or will your friend the more easily suppress his misfortune because you droop under it? He that goes about to comfort another with tears in his own eyes is a professed dissembler with an ill look, and, at the same time, by his own example confuting his discourse, does but confirm the malady he pretends to cure, and is as ridiculously busy as a drunkard preaching up temperance. The afflictions of others are but multiplied, not lessened, by the share we take in them, and he that would remove the grief from another's mind by placing it in his own, does as much good as he that, to save his neighbour's house when it is in flames, sets fire on his own house, whereby the mischief is only made the greater and more incapable of remedy. I would not be thought by this to persuade you to any indecency or ill-nature, but to be wise and careful of your quiet. Every one's share of misfortune is heavy enough for his own shoulders without borrowing loads of his neighbour, and he is very fond of discontents that hunts about for them in the concernments of others and, rather than want troubles, will adopt those of others.

"I am, I know not how, fallen into a grave discourse on a subject I thought not on at the beginning of my letter; but now I am in, let me be in earnest with you. I cannot do you a greater kindness than to assure you against all the accidents of life, and since one who has so many friends as you, and so real a concernment for them lies very open to the assaults of fortune, whilst a painful sympathy shall unite you to their crosses, 'tis fit you retire more within yourself, leave as little room as you can for mishap

and sufferance, and conclude that nothing ought to afflict that does not really hurt you. I that earnestly wish you an enjoyment of perfect happiness cannot but desire and advise that you should feel nothing at all of others' misfortunes and as little as you can of your own. Then a great part will be saved of unprofitable pain and sorrow, which doubtless shortens our lives, both by cutting off a good part of the remainder, and making the present useless. By this time I hope I have sufficiently convinced you that a philosopher of the R.S. may hold a discourse with a female virtuoso without any danger of dulness, and at least I am revenged of you for supposing that my conversation with you is loss of time. If you persist in this opinion, you may perhaps, in my next, meet with another sober lecture. Hoping in the meantime that you will be the better for this, for we philosophers are always in earnest and always expect our rules and advices should be followed, whether they be pertinent or not, and if mine be not reasonable now, 'tis fortune's fault, and let her be answerable for it. She may make them so when she pleases. Therefore pray lay them up till the occasion serves, and then put them in practice."¹

As we do not know of Locke's having any other friend to whom the epithet "Dor." would be applicable, unless as part of a pseudonym, the suspicion necessarily arises that the letter of which that is a fragment was intended for Lady Dorothy Ashley; but it is not easy to understand in what circumstances she could have been either just before or just after her marriage—which took place in September, 1669—to call for such a sober epistle, and especially from Locke, nor is there anything to show that she could be styled, even in compliment, "a female virtuoso." All we can be sure of is that Locke was here addressing some lady whose confidence he possessed, and to whom he felt justified in sending such outspoken advice as would be impertinent if it came from any one but a most intimate friend.

Another intimate friend, whose personality, however, we can to some extent identify, mysteriously introduces

¹ *Shaftesbury Papers*, series viii., no. 2.

herself to us at about the same time. In this case it is a lady who writes to Locke, not Locke to a lady; but her letter is evidently in answer to one, perhaps to one out of a hundred, from him, which cannot now be found.

"MY DEAR BROTHER,—I know not how you have got the start of me, since you cannot be better pleased with our epistolical converse than I am. When I call myself to an account for this, I presently find my error to proceed from those many hours I daily spend with you, concluding that when I have done so, you can have nothing to reproach me with, for methinks you should hear all that I say and be in my company when I am in yours, and that there should be something more than ordinary in those imaginary conferences which pass between us so frequently; for, as your conversation was very agreeable and useful to me in England, so I find ways to make you repeat the same discourses to me here, where my greatest care is to keep myself alive till we meet where we first began that friendship which is above those hazards which usually attend distant friends, and as secure from any decay as the best-natured of us can wish.

"But all this while I forget to tell you how I came to be so much in your debt. Let the cause be what it will, I am sure it is not unkindness, and so long, my D. B., you may pardon my silence. That which to me seems most probable is that, when I read your letters, I think I have sufficiently paid you in believing all that you say in them, and that you are satisfied because I am so; but, upon second thoughts, I blame myself, and am as full of repentance as you are of impatience: I presently lay before me the just rule of doing as I would be done by, and that sets us to rights again; for, while I derive my greatest content from my interest in you, and that I receive the perfectest accomplishment of all my wishes in the assurance you give me of it, I shall always think it fit for me to conclude that I deserve it best when you have least reason to doubt of my being what I ought; and I know no expedient so proper towards the discharge of my conscience as that which frees you from all uneasy apprehensions: for, though raillery represents me delighted with your sufferings, I find nothing more opposite to my nature. Therefore, 'tis but justice in you, my dear brother, to suppose, as you do, that my practice will surely confute the disguised professions of being pleased with your complaints. When they are in earnest, I shall never exercise any cruelty which may not become the strictest and best-grounded friendship; for I can with great security protest that nature could not have given you a sister that would have been, in her concern and

value for you, half what I am, though but an adopted one. This subject is very insinuating, and such as I could say more on than is necessary, considering how few there are who have the happiness to understand one another better. Let us, therefore, leave our superfluous protestations to new beginners, and leave them that to set up with which we do not want, nor, if I mistake not, never shall. 'Tis not that I mean by this to lay aside the life of friendship and satisfy myself with the opinion I have of it. That will not answer the felicity we aim at. There must be constant demonstrations added to our confidence,—for it's most certainly the delightfulest entertainment in the world to be often told what one is willing to hear, and to be assured at all distances that those are our friends whom we desire should be so.

“I will not so much as think that I begin to grow tedious, since you have checked my saying something like it in my last; but, with the impudence of the female predicatress, talk on as if I said the finest things imaginable, and as if you were bound in duty to hear the impertinences of a she-virtuoso which you have encouraged and introduced into the society of the wisest amongst the wits. If the presbyterian praters were as easily understood as we women preachers, their trade would soon fail them, for their ambiguities are as necessary for their purpose as our plain doctrine is useful for us, since the soundness of ours consists in honest simple truth, and that we are not sure to be in the right till better judges approve what we assert.

“After all this fair weather you must expect a storm, and I am resolved to wind up all in an use of reproof, and ring you an angry peal at the close of the day.

“Pray tell me what you mean by the melancholy hints you give me of your retiring out of the battle of this life. It perplexes me to hear such doleful things come from you, and, though there follows a seeming allay, and that you say it is only to adorn your letter and make it *à la mode*, yet it is not sufficient to warrant me from those disturbances which I shall always have, whenever I suspect any disorder in you. I might believe, as you would have me, that you are in jest, if I did not know your care to preserve my quiet, and that you are so extraordinary a friend that you rather choose to suffer all yourself than let me share it with you. 'Tis a considerate kindness in you, my D. B.; but that shall not serve your turn, no more than it does mine. I must know more particularly than so what makes you to quarrel thus with the world, and whether the admonitions you give me to prepare me for the disappointments of it be occasioned by any accident which I do not know. You give me a great deal of good advice,

which I receive with a sense proportionable to the benefit you designed me in it. Let me know that it has no relation to yourself, and I will promise you to follow it as well as I can; but, till I am sure of that, I must be allowed to fear that fortune intends me a more severe trial than that which you seem to arm me against. I confess, with you, that wise persons will be content with their own troubles, without hunting abroad for them in the concernments of others; but still there are some things which may very reasonably touch them. Nay, I know that even you, my dear brother, with all your philosophy, are as little able to defend yourself against such defeats as you are liable to as the veriest woman of us all. I know that you have more than your share of tenderness, and pray be not ashamed to own it till it makes you suffer for an ill cause.

"I hope the late fierce cold has spared your lungs, and that this warm season will prove favourable to you, and consequently to all those who would not have you die as long as they live. I will consent you should talk of your death and burial, and be as romantic as my beloved author; but you are to take notice that, whatever you do with yourself in my absence, I shall require your appearance when I come to the place where I left you. But now I think on't, that was in a dusty highway. For cleanliness, therefore, and other conveniences, let it be in the sober dark chamber in the long gallery, or rather in the pretty arbour at the end of the fine garden, where we have spent some hours as agreeably as I daresay either of us have done since, or shall do till we meet there or somewhere else again. We are here so idle that the best improvement we can make of our time is to resolve to spend it better hereafter. Cowley's wish is often my contemplation, and when I go about to fancy myself a happiness, I find it nowhere so well suited to my inclination as in his choice of a little house, a large garden, a few friends, and because I have not his learning, I will leave his many books, and take only his retirement, to which I would add nothing but some rambling groves, and there would I, with the best of these few friends, pity those who flatter themselves with an opinion of being happier than

"Your faithful and most affectionate

"B. D.

"Our silenced Mr. Blo. has often desired me to present his service to my friend Mr. Locke, and he would not forgive me if he thought that this were the first time of his being mentioned. I writ to you by Mr. Gee four or five days since. Sir C. B., your pupil, took this place in his way

home two or three days after, but I did not care to say anything to you by so great a courtier." ¹

Whatever else this curious letter indicates, it plainly shows that the writer, having written to him four or five days before, sorry that she could not write again two or three days later, and now pouring forth so many effusive paragraphs, was really, as she signed herself, Locke's "faithful and most affectionate B. D." It is clear, too, that the "Mr. Blo" whom she disposed of so summarily in the postscript was her husband, the Reverend Thomas Blomer, as we have later letters in the same handwriting, signed either "M. B." or "M. Blomer," and all endorsed by Locke as received from "Mrs. Blomer." In some of these letters, moreover, she referred to a Mrs. Grigg as her sister; and we shall presently find Locke alluding to Mrs. Grigg in terms from which it is necessary to conclude that she was his cousin. Therefore we may regard this much, at any rate, as certain: that B. D.—to whom Locke may have applied, and who may therefore have adopted, those initials in transposition of the initials D. B., "dear brother," which she seems to have been fond of applying to him—was Mrs. Blomer, his "adopted sister" and his actual cousin. As we do not even know the Christian names either of Mrs. Blomer or Mrs. Grigg, it is not possible to obtain any more exact information as to their relationship to him; but this, perhaps, is not of much consequence.

Far more welcome, if it were procurable, would be some information as to the antecedents of this full-grown intimacy between Locke and Mrs. Blomer. Had it

¹ *Shaftesbury Papers*, series viii., no. 20; B. D. to Locke, 24 Jan., 1669-70.

started in childhood? or was it of more recent origin? Had it any connection with an old allusion in Locke's letter to his father which has been quoted, in which he said in 1660, "If I have any reflections on or desires of free and competent subsistence, it is more in reference to another, whom you may guess, to whom I am very much obliged, than for myself"? or with a sentence in the letter that Locke wrote in 1666 to a friend in Dublin, declining the offer of preferment in the church, in which he said, "If I am covetous of any good fortune, 'tis that one I love may share it with me"? These may be subjects for guesses; but, whatever the answer, let it be remembered that from the time when we begin to know anything of Mrs. Blomer, she was the wife of a clergyman, who also, as we shall presently see, spoke of her as Locke's "sister," and was on friendly terms with him; and that the intimacy between them, however affectionate, was one that they had no reason to hide from the world. Mrs. Blomer has just told us that Locke had introduced her into "the society of the wisest amongst the wits," and had encouraged her to be "a she-virtuoso." There was nothing clandestine, therefore there can have been nothing dishonourable, in their intercourse.

Mrs. Blomer's husband, a native of Cheshire, had been Locke's schoolfellow at Westminster,¹ and had proceeded to Cambridge a year after Locke went to Oxford.² Hence we may infer, as Locke was older than the average of Westminster boys, that he was Locke's junior by three or four years. He obtained a fellowship in 1658; was made master of arts in 1660; and in 1663

¹ 'Alumni Westmonasteriensis,' p. 141.

² *Additional MSS.*, no. 5846, p. 267, in the British Museum.

³ *Ibid.*, pp. 242, 318.

was incorporated at Oxford.¹ After that, though exactly when is not clear, he entered the household of the Earl of Northumberland, evidently as a chaplain, Mapletoft, who had been his schoolfellow as well as his college companion, being at the same time a member of the same family as tutor to Lord Percy, who in 1668 succeeded to the earldom; and, if Locke and Blomer had not kept up their schoolboy acquaintance, Mapletoft may have brought them together again. Mrs. Blomer was also a member of the Percy household, in attendance on the wife of Mapletoft's sometime pupil, now Earl of Northumberland. She was in Paris with Lady Northumberland in January, 1669-70, when she wrote her long letter to Locke, and did not return to England till the following summer, when Lady Northumberland came home as a widow, her young husband having died in Italy in May. During the next two years both Mr. and Mrs. Blomer continued to reside with the countess, sometimes at Northumberland House in the Strand, but generally at Petworth. From Petworth Blomer wrote in August, 1670, asking Locke to use influence with Lord Ashley towards procuring him some clerical or scholastic promotion, and informing him with great detail concerning the health of his "dearest sister." "I know you can endure anything that brings you news of her," he said, by way of apology for his letter.²

We have other letters from Mrs. Blomer to Locke, but, before turning to them, we must notice one or two other matters.

Locke and Mapletoft had been intimate friends during

¹ 'Catalogue of Oxford Graduates between 1659 and 1850' (1851), p. 67.

² *Shaftesbury Papers*, series ii., no. 192; Blomer to Locke, August, 1670.

at least two or three years before the date of the first letter between them which has come down to us. At some time before July, 1670, Mapletoft had, as a physician, accompanied the Earl of Essex on a diplomatic mission to Copenhagen, and Locke now wrote to express his satisfaction at his friend's unexpected return, as well as to contradict some erroneous information he had given in a previous letter about the health of a Mr. Beavis, in whom, and in whose wife yet more, Mapletoft seems to have been much interested. "I cannot forbear with all speed," Locke said, "to acknowledge my late mistake and to send you the good news of Mr. Beavis's happy recovery. I know the news of my lord of Northumberland's death hath given you but too much sadness, and you need not be disturbed with any new apprehension. But my too just fears could not be hindered from speaking themselves to one who was not like to hear them with indifferency." Locke then set himself, in a rather clumsy way, to enliven Mapletoft by banter. "Now the storm is over; if you will allow me to be merry with you, methinks you could not possibly have been in any country whither I could with so much confidence have sent you bad tidings as that you now are in, where every place so abounds with antidotes against fear and sorrow, where every meal is designed to drown the memory of all affliction. Is it possible one could shrink at the approaches of a sad story, being guarded and beset with an army of stout Dutch-bellied rummers? All the doubt is that you, like others of our profession, were a little squeamish towards your remedies and did not take down your dose as you ought to do and accommodate yourself to the new way of taking physic by the yard." "Any grave reflection of mine," Locke added, in excuse

for writing in this way, "would, I think, do you but little service, and for me to furnish out reasons against sorrow, and to imagine that you had not strength enough to cope with calamities, were to be ignorant of Dr. Mapletoft and forget the person I am writing to. This same sober sadness looks so ill in Mrs. Beavis, and has done her so little good, that I begin to be out of love with it in myself and all my friends." There is much else in this letter about Mrs. Beavis and her depression. "Dr. Sydenham desires to be very kindly remembered to you," is added in a postscript.¹

Locke seems at the time when he wrote that letter to have been as busy with medical work as his other occupations would allow. One patient whom he had to attend in August was, as we have seen, Lady Dorothy Ashley; another was the husband of his cousin, Mrs. Grigg, who has been already named.

We know a little more of Thomas Grigg than of his wife. He was born at Bristol, apparently in 1638, and thus may have been an old acquaintance of Locke's family, if not of Locke himself. He was educated at Trinity College, Oxford, where in 1665 he obtained a fellowship and the degree of bachelor of divinity; and at the university he had the reputation of being "an excellent scholar for Greek, Latin and philosophy, and also an admirable preacher."² A little while before that, probably in September, 1663, he was appointed chaplain to Dr. Hensch-

¹ *European Magazine*, vol. xiv. (1788), p. 321; Locke to Mapletoft, 10 July, 1670. In successive numbers of this magazine were printed several of Locke's letters to Mapletoft, said to be from the originals in the possession of "Mr. Mapletoft, an eminent surgeon at Chertsey, who is grandson to Dr. Mapletoft."

² Wood, 'Fasti Oxonienses,' part ii., col. 282.

man, who then exchanged the bishopric of Salisbury for that of London.¹ After this, for the short remainder of his life, he made rapid progress in the church. In September, 1664, his bishop made him rector of St. Andrew Undershaft, in the city of London, and to that office was added, in March, 1666-7, a prebend in St. Paul's Cathedral.² If we may trust the funeral sermon commemorating his virtues, worth and learning, preached in his honour by the famous Dr. Simon Patrick,³ he gave promise of becoming a rival of Tillotson or Stillingfleet. But being at Bristol in the middle of August, 1670, he became so ill that he deemed it necessary to come up to London and on his arrival Locke found that he was in a violent fever. Locke attended him constantly until the morning of the 2nd of September, when he died at the age of thirty-two. "Vir optimus" is the concise epitaph written in Locke's medical note book.⁴

Locke, as was natural, took a special interest in this case, and when he found that he could not keep his cousin's husband alive, he did everything in his power to lighten her trouble. "'Tis fit I should thank you," Mrs. Blomer wrote to him from Petworth, immediately afterwards, "for your charitable care of the poor little disconsolate widow, though I know you do not expect it; but, as it is the best part of payment, it must not be omitted. The main reward is to come from him who has given you a mind above other men. How much the loss of this good man has afflicted me is easier for you to imagine

¹ Newcourt, 'Repertorium Ecclesiasticum Parochiale Londinense' (1708), vol. i., p. 32.

² *Ibid*, vol. i., pp. 268, 212, 230.

³ Patrick, 'Sermon preached at the Funeral of Mr. T. Grigg' (1670).

⁴ *Additional MSS.*, no. 5714, in the British Museum.

than for me to express. I hope God will support my sister under this severe stroke, and make her able to go through this deplorable change of her condition."¹

A passage in this letter seems to imply that, when informing Mrs. Blomer of her brother-in-law's death, Locke had made some complaint about the shortness, or coldness, or infrequency of her letters to him. "Pray," she wrote, "forbear thinking worse of me than I deserve, since you can hardly be just if you do not think my friendship for you unalterable; for, as I have formerly professed, no condition shall ever make me lose one grain of the esteem and kindness which you have so well deserved from me. Methinks I say more than is necessary upon this score; for I would fain live so with you, my dear brother, as never to suspect one another, and if I know my own heart, I am never better pleased than when I can assure myself that Mr. Locke is not only my best brother, but my sure friend. Believe this truth, and you will never mistake my silence for a wilful neglect, nor harbour any opinion of me that would not become a friend of the first rank."

"My lady has not been well since she came into the country," Mrs. Blomer added in the same letter. "If she does not mend, a few weeks may bring us into your neighbourhood again, and, if that does not prove effectual, I doubt there will be a necessity for our going again into France, which I cannot think of with any pleasure. In the meantime prepare yourself against next spring, and remember you are to go with us." Hence it is clear that Locke had arranged to go to France with Lady Northumberland in 1671. He now startled Mrs. Blomer, it would appear, by saying he was so ill that he must go thither

¹ *Shaftesbury Papers*, series viii., no. 9; M. B. to Locke, 12 Sept., 1670.

at once. The announcement brought from her this reply:—

“MY DEAR BROTHER,—If all the kind things you say in your letter be not sufficient to make me amends for the alarm you give me at the conclusion of it, you may easily imagine (without lessening the value I have for your friendship) what my concern is when you so plainly tell me that 'tis France must give you life. This declaration, from a man not accustomed to represent things worse than they are, cannot but create such apprehensions in me as must of necessity be very uneasy and lasting. I have pleased myself with the thoughts of going to London, upon no other account than that of being within reach of you; for I need not tell you that my fondness for the town is not great; and yet I would willingly have endured all the noise and clatter of so confused a mass to be where part of my time might be spent with you. But, if that satisfaction fail me, I shall recall my former opinion, that nothing is lasting that pleases, be it never so allowable. 'Tis a severe decree that will not suffer us to enjoy that long which we once begin to delight in. I confess, my dear brother, 'twill be hard for me to part with that friendship which I so heartily bespoke of you, not for myself alone, but for all those whom duty and nature should oblige me to wish well unto. I can never say enough of this till you and I (and one more) meet, which I hope may be about a month hence; and then we intend to persuade you to live longer, for, I assure you, you have here two friends that would be glad you would never forsake them. They have laid a trap for you, and you must help them to catch you in it, upon this confidence, that, if our wishes prevail, you shall not think yourself a prisoner, nor the trap we threaten you with an uneasy tenement: there shall be nothing in it but what will study to divert and preserve you. But all this is too obscure, and nothing but an interview can clear it. In the meantime, take care of yourself. I know the little spark will, for the public good, assist you with hers.

“My dear brother, I long to see you; but my present impatience will be to hear that your cough is abated. I can say nothing of my own health till yours is better. Farewell!

“I am, your most affectionate sister,

“M.B.”¹

¹ *Shaftesbury Papers*, series viii., no. 10; M. B. to Locke, 23 Sept., 1670. I have not quoted a postscript to this letter, in which Mrs. Blomer refers to some efforts that her husband was making on behalf of Mrs. Grigg.

There is nothing to show whether these friends met at the month's end, or what was the trap which Mrs. Blomer and "one more" were planning, or whether the "little spark" was identical with the "one more;" but it is clear that Locke was now really ill, and felt the necessity of doing something to cure himself. Overworked in London, he went away, though not so far as France, probably before Mrs. Blomer's letter was written. He was at Salisbury, visiting his old friend Dr. Thomas, in October, when he said, in a letter to Mapletoft, "My first remove was from your town to Oxford, where either my constantly being abroad in the air as much as the clouds would permit, or in good company at home, made me believe I mended apace, and my cough sensibly abated. From thence I came hither about the middle of last week, where I fear the air will not be so advantageous to me; for at best I have but made a stand, if not gone backwards, in this watery place, and therefore I think I shall make but a short abode here."¹

"I must conclude my carcass to be made of a very ill composition," Locke added a day or two afterwards, in a supplementary letter enclosed in the same cover, "that will not grow into good plight in fresh air, so much improved by the good wishes of my friends, and, whilst my mind is at perfect ease in so full an enjoyment of what I most desire, methinks my body should batten. What will be the issue I know not; but, if I should return that burly man you speak of, I shall put nothing into your embraces you will not have a just title to. To confess truly to you, I find so much regret to be at a distance from those friends you wish me with, that I think I may

¹ *European Magazine*, vol. xiv. (1788), p. 401; Locke to Mapletoft, 10 Oct. [1670].

be excused if I am not yet willing to take my last farewell of them." The rest of the paragraph is not clear, as we do not know who was the doctor with whom Mapletoft proposed that his friend should pass the winter. Probably, knowing that he overworked himself at Exeter House, Mapletoft urged him to take rest in some quiet country place. "The winter quarters you have provided for me," wrote Locke, "I think not only preferable to the solitariness of the grave, but the gaiety of courts or other admired places of the world. All that I am afraid of is that I shall be no more fit for that excellent person's company than if I were really taken out of the grave, and, however you have dressed me up to him, you will use your friend the doctor little better than he that joined the living and the dead together."¹

Concerning Locke's illness at this time we have no more precise information than is contained in the extracts lately made. There cannot be much doubt, however, that his cough was connected with symptoms of disease in the lungs; and the weakness and irritability thus induced evidently caused an occasional depression of spirits, and may have led him to think himself more ill than he really was.

During the winter of 1670-1 he appears to have resided generally at Exeter House; but we get no precise account of his movements for nearly a year after his letters to Mapletoft from Salisbury, in October, 1670.

In the interval we meet with only one short letter from Mrs. Blomer, who had a "little spark" of a baby now to keep her thoughts more at home, and would rather that Locke should come down to Petworth to see him and her

¹ *European Magazine*, vol. xiv. (1788), p. 401; Locke to Mapletoft, Oct. [1670].

and other folk whose company would be certain to cheer him, than look for her in the dusty streets of London, or meet her in the bustling gaiety of Northumberland House. "I chose to come and say something to you, dear brother," she wrote prettily in July, 1671, "rather than to take an evening walk with Mr. Blomer and the little *femme*, who were very earnest with me to go with them. Had you been of the company, I should not have disputed the matter. I hope you have received so favourable a description of Petworth as to be encouraged to come and see it, especially now that the house swarms with your friends and humble servants. I could tell you a thousand fine exploits of our little spark, but that shall be the work of another day."¹

That letter was addressed to Locke at Exeter House. He was just then, as we have seen, at St. Giles's, himself looking after a baby—Lady Dorothy's. He was in London in August; but he left it again, probably to go first to Oxford, in September, and reached Sutton, the home of his old friend John Strachey, and the centre of his boyish haunts, early in October. "To Mrs. Grigg," he said in the postscript to a letter to Mapletoft, which he wrote from Sutton, "let me be kindly remembered, and let her know that her and my uncle Locke, who is by whilst I write this, remember her."² The letter itself chiefly referred to Locke's health, which, if not good, seems to have been better than in the previous autumn. He had not yet gone to France, as Mrs. Blomer had hoped; but now Mapletoft had written strongly urging

¹ *Shaftesbury Papers*, series viii., no. 13; Mrs. Blomer to Locke, 10 July, 1671.

² *European Magazine*, vol. xiv. (1788), p. 322; Locke to Mapletoft, 7 Oct., 1671.

him to make the journey. He seems, however, to have preferred the north of London to the south of France. "I am now making haste back again to London," he said, "and then, having made you judge of my state of health, shall desire your advice what you think best to be done; wherein you are to deal with me with the same freedom, since nothing will be able to make me leave those friends I have in England but the positive direction of some of those friends for my going. But, however I dispose of myself, I shall dwell amidst the marks of your kindness, and shall enjoy the air of Hampstead Heath or Montpellier as that wherein your care and friendship hath placed me."

Whatever Mapletoft advised, Locke did not go France till September in the next year, and then they went together. The Countess of Northumberland then made her long-talked-of journey, taking with her Mr. and Mrs. Blomer and the rest of her family, as she intended to make a long residence abroad. Mapletoft accompanied her as her physician, and Locke went for a little while as her guest. Lord Ashley, now the Earl of Shaftesbury, and risen high in royal favour, was not able to spare his adviser-in-chief for long; but he gave him two or three weeks' holiday, and Locke, though forty years old, evidently enjoyed his first visit to France as thoroughly as any schoolboy could. On his return he thus wrote to Mapletoft:—

"DEAR DOCTOR,—I want nothing to complete all the satisfaction I could expect from a journey that carried me away from you, but an assurance that you and the rest of that good company with you accomplished yours with as good success, though I hope with better weather than we did ours. For, whether it were that hardships do naturally attend the undertaking of puissant as well as errant knights, and that heaven seldom smiles upon their enterprises, or whether the tutelar angel of the country would not

favour the flight of a man that had bilked one of the most considerable men of the place—for what more worthy person than a French tailor? or what greater offence can there be than to go away in his debt?—but whatever the cause, so it was, that from the time we took horse at Paris, which was within an hour or two after your departure, till we came to Calais, we had not one dry day, and, as if all the rain that was stored in the clouds had been laid up there only for us, when we got within a league of Calais, it fell on us as if it had been poured down with buckets, which violence of the storm pursued us till we just got at the gates, and, as soon as we were got to shelter, it presently broke up, and we had no rain till after we had been several days in England.

“This wet was some of the worst of our story, for we had by the way some adventures worth reciting, which I must adjourn till another time, that I may do what is more necessary for me and may return those thanks which those obligations I received when I was with you call for from me. You know how little skill I have in speeches, and my ignorance in French, which is the very mint of compliment, will excuse a dull oyster if it only gape, and by that you must guess at my meaning, which is all manner of thanks and acknowledgment to that excellent lady to whose favour I owe my voyage and all the advantages of it. This you are to put in the best words you can find, and on this occasion you cannot say too much. For, if Léoncourt and Chantilly, St. Germain and the Louvre, be sights which cannot be sufficiently admired, I'm sure there cannot be enough said in return for that favour which added a grace even to those fine places, and made me value the sight of them more than otherwise I should have done. When you are about to do me this kindness, I would not have you reflect upon my declining to perfect the recovery of my health in so advantageous a way and in your company, lest you should think so inconsiderate a man unworthy of your patronage, and forbear to say something for me which may preserve me from being thought ungrateful even for that health which I have got by going so far, and which I should be glad to employ in the service of those to whose kindness I am indebted for it. But you know that our journey as well as pilgrimage in this world have their settled bounds, and none of us can go beyond the extent of that tether which certainly ties us. In that dancing country, where every one thinks he may skip up and down as he will, I know not whether you will admit of that doctrine. But, think it as extravagant as you will, I'm sure so I found it, and Mr. Vernon, if he be with you, will justify this fatal necessity.

“Pray present my most humble service to Lady Betty. To Mrs. Ramsay,

with my service, give an account that her letters were safe delivered at Northumberland House. Let Dr. Blomer and my sister know that I have a great deal of service for them, and that I delivered the one's letters and the other's tokens. Dr. Tillotson was well satisfied about the books, but the two *femmes* are like to go together by the ears which shall have both the sleeves. They have only made a truce for so long till she can send them word whether there be any French trick to make one sleeve serve for two arms. In the meantime they grumble and desire her to remember that all the cold in the world (however she be troubled with it) is not in France, and that such scanty clothing will scarce preserve a warm remembrance of her in her friends in England this winter. Pray also remember me very kindly to my brother Seawen, to whom pray give this enclosed bill, with my service and thanks. I had writ to him myself this turn, had not my chimney been this day on fire, which filled my chamber with so much company, smoke and confusion, that I have scarce recovered breath yet, and shall not bring myself and things in order this good while. But pray tell him I sent his letters away by the post as soon as I came to town, which was that day seventhnight I parted from you, and his token to Dr. Millington I sent away since by a safe hand.

“ And now I come to you, beloved, first with a word of information that your cousin Collet is well, and his wife well brought to bed the day after I returned; Mr. Firmin and his wife very well. Secondly, with a use of discomfort, because there is yet no use nor principal to be got. I wish Poole hold staunch, for Mary and Maning, I fear, are leaky vessels, and hold nothing but emptiness. But of this affair your cousin Collet and I will take all the care we can; and when this is done, whatever happens, I think you will not have one sigh the more, nor will I have one laugh the less.

“ The prorogation of parliament till the spring I doubt not but you have heard of. Other news we have little, the king being but just returned from Newmarket. I desire to hear from you how you all do, and where you have lived, and whether anybody went along the journey with you besides your own company; for we have no news of Mr. J. S., who, if he were in England, I am confident would tell us so. I wish you all manner of happiness, and am your most humble and obedient servant,

“ J. LOCKE.

“ My service to Mrs. Alice.”¹

¹ *European Magazine*, vol. xv. (1789), p. 9; Locke to Mapletoft, 19 Oct., 1672.

CHAPTER VI.

IN THE EARL OF SHAFTESBURY'S FAMILY.

[1672—1675.]

ON the 23rd of April, 1672, in reward for his services as a minister of Charles the Second, and as a mark of his growing favour at court, Lord Ashley was raised to the peerage as Earl of Shaftesbury; on the 27th of September he was made president of the council of trade and plantations; and on the 17th of November he was appointed lord high chancellor of England. As these fresh dignities and offices brought Locke into much closer and more influential relations with political affairs, their antecedents must be briefly reviewed, in order that we may understand his new position.

Shaftesbury, as Lord Ashley, had held the post of chancellor of the exchequer ever since May, 1661, but his influence in the government had varied greatly at different times. Such close cohesion, mutual dependence, and joint responsibility as now exists among cabinet ministers, were then only beginning very faintly to grow up, and Ashley remained in office when he was at variance as well as when he was in harmony with Clarendon, his recognised chief, and with other members of the government. Clarendon being a tory and Ashley a whig, the points of agreement between them were few and for the

most part accidental. Ashley's great abilities and his weight in the country made it impossible for him to be dispensed with, but while Clarendon was in power he was not often allowed to take a prominent share in public business outside his own department, for the management of which he seems to have had no special fitness. When Clarendon fell into disgrace, however, Ashley, apparently on patriotic grounds, tempered by jealousy of the Duke of Buckingham, supported him, and this action, together with the malady by which he was then crippled, rendered it easier for his new rival to inherit the chief portion of the deposed statesman's authority.

Though by no means meriting all the scorn conveyed in Dryden's famous lines upon the man who mocked him in 'The Rehearsal,'—

“ A man so various that he seem'd to be
Not one, but all mankind's epitome ;
Stiff in opinion, always in the wrong ;
Was everything by starts, and nothing long ;
But in the course of one revolving moon
Was chymist, fiddler, statesman and buffoon ;
Then all for women, painting, rhyming, drinking,
Besides ten thousand freaks that died in thinking ;”¹

—though showing indisputable capacities for statesmanship, and sometimes, when he could hardly be suspected of intentional dishonesty and guidance by merely selfish motives, for generous and patriotic conduct—Buckingham was too true a representative of all the worst social and political vices of Charles the Second's day to deserve more honour than posterity has generally accorded to him. The best thing that can be said of him is that all through his public career he steadily opposed

¹ 'Absalom and Achitophel,' ll. 545—552.

the persecuting efforts and achievements of the tory and high church party, and was in that way a consistent advocate, according to his light, of the better policy that Locke propounded and that Ashley laboured to enforce. In some other respects, being a whig as far as he was anything, he and Ashley were in agreement, while there were very few points of sympathy indeed—community in libertinism being not generally a source of harmony—between him and his greatest rival, Lord Arlington. Therefore, having gained the supremacy in 1667, he was glad to seek the co-operation of Lord Ashley, and that, probably from selfish as well as from honest motives, was granted, there being even less sympathy between Ashley and Arlington, now that the private catholicism of the latter was beginning to be guessed at, if not known, than between Buckingham and Arlington. During the next few years Buckingham was the leader of the cabal—a term then applied to all the informal committees of favoured privy councillors, out of which the more modern system of cabinet government was developed. Arlington had the next place of honour; but Ashley was the rising statesman. Lauderdale, always an indefatigable schemer, was generally induced to confine his scheming to the management of those Scottish affairs which were specially and formally assigned to him; and Sir Thomas Clifford, though an able and unscrupulous politician, was as yet too young and inexperienced to merit the accidental prominence given to him by the fact that the initial letter of his name placed him first among the members of this particular Cabal, the most memorable of all cabals.

If Clarendon's tyrannical policy in ecclesiastical matters, and his devotion, far greater than Charles the Second's,

to Charles-the-First modes of government, were the most justifiable grounds of his impeachment, and if the king's personal animosity was its immediate cause, it was mainly favoured by the people because they attributed to him not only the sale of Dunkirk, but the ignominious ending of the ignominious war with Holland, which he had done all he could to avert in 1665, and which he could not bring to any better close than by the terms of the treaty of Breda in July, 1667. The popularity of Buckingham's cabal was greatly promoted by the formation of the triple alliance—between England, Holland, and Sweden, against France—in January, 1667-8; that being, indeed, the most popular measure of the whole reign. It was immediately followed by the most disgraceful measure of the reign, Charles's secret treaty with Louis the Fourteenth—secret even from Buckingham and other members of the government, but promoted by Arlington and Clifford—which began to be negotiated in the following July, and was completed at Dover in June, 1670.

By the expressed terms of the treaty, England and France were to begin a new war with Holland, popery was to be made the national religion of England, with the assistance of the French troops if necessary, and Charles the Second was to receive a pension of 120,000*l.* a year from King Louis while the Dutch war lasted, and a reward of 80,000*l.* for his change of the nation's faith; by its unexpressed terms all the courtiers and politicians who aided the projects were to be well bribed. Ashley knew nothing of that secret treaty, its conditions being confided to none who could not be trusted to approve of them, and thus he was duped into becoming one of the signatories to a mock treaty, intended for publication in

lieu of it, which was completed in December, 1670, and in which, nothing being said of the wholesale and forced conversion of England to catholicism, the war with Holland was again agreed upon, and Charles's rewards and pensions were represented as being merely contributions in aid of the military expenses that he was to incur. As there were delays in beginning the war, a new edition of this mock treaty was prepared in February, 1671-2, again with Ashley's signature, as well as Buckingham's, Arlington's, Clifford's, and Lauderdale's.¹

It would have been better for Ashley's reputation had he had nothing at all to do with these monstrous negotiations. But both he and Buckingham justified themselves for favouring war with Holland on the plea that it was necessary for England's chief commercial rival to be humbled; and it is to his credit that he alone, among all the leading politicians of the time, took no bribes from France.

It may well be doubted whether Charles ever really intended to establish popery in England, or whether, in consenting to the clause in the secret treaty which prescribed that, he had any other design than the very practical one of increasing the bribe that Louis the Fourteenth proposed to pay to him for making England the cat's-paw of France in its designs against Holland. Being himself a catholic, he would not, of course, object to change the national religion, if it could be easily done; but he could have had no mind to stir up a rebellion that would endanger his crown. It is only reasonable to sur-

¹ A full account of all these disgraceful proceedings, with documentary evidence, will be found in Mignet's '*Negociations relatives à la Succession d'Espagne*' (1835), t. iii. See also Dalrymple's '*Memoirs of Great Britain and Ireland*.'

nise that he merely intended to humour the French king and the English catholics.

The first step taken with that view was characteristic of him and his advisers. In 1667—the year in which Locke wrote his ‘Essay concerning Toleration’—Buckingham, aided by Ashley and other friends of religious liberty, by churchmen like Tillotson, and puritans like Baxter, had endeavoured so far to revolutionise the church of England as to enable all but the most fanatical dissenters to become members of it. This scheme of comprehension, however, had been indignantly rejected by the house of commons. The conventicle act of 1664, the force of which had been limited to four years, had lapsed in 1668, and Buckingham and his friends had endeavoured to prevent its renewal; but the conventicle act had been established as a permanent law, with fresh severity, in 1670. Parliament was evidently in no mood to show tolerance towards either dissenters or papists; and, if anything was to be done in that way, the king and his advisers saw that it must be done in defiance of parliament. Accordingly, the memorable declaration of indulgence was issued on the 15th of March, 1671-2.

In that document the king proclaimed himself “obliged to make use of that supreme power in ecclesiastical matters which is not only inherent in us, but hath been declared and recognised to be so by several statutes and acts of parliament;” and directed that “the execution of all manner of penal laws in matters ecclesiastical, against whatsoever sort of nonconformists or recusants, be immediately suspended.” The declaration avowedly and really made greater concessions to the protestant dissenters than to the papists; and on that account it was supported, if indeed it was not actually drafted, by

Lord Ashley ; but there was such a dangerous precedent for violation of the rights and liberties of the people in its avowed overriding of the decisions of parliament that nearly all the dissenters refused to avail themselves of its benefits and all classes of the community condemned it. Parliament had been prorogued from April, 1671, till April, 1672 ; but fear of opposition both to the declaration of indulgence and to the Dutch war that had been, fairly or unfairly, begun in March, 1671-2, induced the government to prorogue it for another year, and soon after the reassembling of the commons, in February, 1672-3, the declaration was so severely complained against that it had to be withdrawn.

Another and even more unjustifiable measure incident to the secret treaty with the French king and its issues, was the stop of the exchequer, as it was termed. The house of commons having in the spring of 1671 been less liberal in its supplies than the government desired, and additional funds being greatly needed for preparations for the war with Holland, it was ordered, on the 2nd of January, 1671-2, that no payments of any sort should be made out of the exchequer, during the next twelve months, on account of any warrants or other securities given by the government. Ever since the Restoration it had been customary for the crown to borrow from the goldsmiths, who then acted as bankers, whatever money it required or could obtain on bills payable out of the exchequer—that is, in fact, to forestall by a few months the income to be derived from taxes allowed by parliament or from other sources of revenue. The debt for which the honour of the state was thus pledged amounted to about 1,300,000*l.* when the goldsmiths were informed that this money would not be paid to them for a year at

any rate, and were left to infer, as they chose, either that the government was bankrupt, or that it intended to rob them of their due. As far as the credit of the state was concerned, these alternatives were about equally deplorable, and the scandal was hardly increased by the fact that a great many of the goldsmiths were ruined, and that the consequent panic spread from England into all the countries of Europe which were then concerned in international finance.

As Lord Ashley was chancellor of the exchequer, it is not very strange that he was held responsible for this gross and foolish piece of dishonesty. But it has been clearly proved that the culprit was Sir Thomas Clifford, one of the commissioners holding the office of lord treasurer, and that Ashley stoutly protested against it at the time.¹ To the king he forcibly represented, among other points, that "it was contrary to common justice among men," that "it must amaze mankind, and would ruin thousands, amongst whom were a number of poor widows and orphans," and that "it would immediately cause the greatest damp on trade that had ever been known."² On his own confession, however, he was not free from so much blame as attaches to a man who, knowing that a crime is about to be committed, does no more than privately expostulate with the wrong-doers. "I shall not deny," he wrote naïvely to Locke, who evidently at the time was as ignorant of this state plot as of the secret treaty of Dover, "but that I knew earlier of the counsel, and foresaw what necessarily it must produce sooner than other men, having the advantage of being more versed in the king's secret affairs; but I hope

¹ Christie, 'Life of the First Earl of Shaftesbury,' vol. ii., pp. 56—68.

² *Ibid.*, vol. ii., p. 59.

it will not be expected by any that do in the least know me that I should have discovered the king's secret or betrayed his business, whatever my thoughts were of it."¹ Perhaps it is not easy for any statesman to be altogether an honest man. At any rate Shaftesbury was right in saying that no one could expect perfect honesty from a statesman of the reign of Charles the Second.

Locke had not long returned from his short holiday in France when Shaftesbury was made lord chancellor; and in November, 1672, as soon as the new functionary could organise his establishment, Locke was appointed by him secretary of presentations, that is, director of all church matters coming under the chancellor's control, with a salary of 300*l.* a year.²

In a list of "my lord chancellor's family," dated Christmas, 1672, we find him described as the holder of that office, Thomas Stringer, Shaftesbury's old private secretary, being now steward of the house, and Bennet, apparently the same person who had introduced Locke to Shaftesbury in 1666, being secretary for defendants. The whole "family," including a page or "boy" assigned to Locke, numbered thirty-seven persons, and Locke was named as one of the nine principal officers who dined at the steward's, that is, at Stringer's table, and who were "to have wine." From this curious document we also learn that he, with the other officers, was expected, in term time, to attend prayers at seven and at eleven every morning and at six every afternoon, "and on every Sunday in the morning a sermon, and on Easter Sunday

¹ Christie, vol. ii., p. 62; Shaftesbury to Locke, 23 Nov., 1674.

² *Shaftesbury Papers*, series viii., no. 28.

and Whit Sunday and Christmas Day a communion." When the chancellor drove out in state, Locke, with the other secretaries, walked by the side of the coach, except at certain times, when they "rid on horseback;" but "when my lord went to take coach or came out of his coach," they "went before him bareheaded."¹

Locke's new occupations appear to have given him plenty of work. "Dr. Sydenham and I mention you sometimes," he wrote to Mapletoft, "for we do not now meet often, my business now allowing me but little leisure for visits;" and in the same letter he spoke of "the confusion and disorder of new affairs to a man not versed in the world."² But his official duties were not of a sort to require much notice here. They were connected only with technical details, of no interest at the present day, respecting clerical appointments and promotions, adjustment of parochial affairs, and so forth.³

Some of the outside duties that fell to him, not exactly as secretary of presentations, but as one of the chancellor's right-hand men, are of more permanent interest.

With one business of special importance he had a great deal to do. The prorogation of parliament from the 22nd of April, 1671, had been protracted for state reasons till the 4th of February, 1672-3, and, in anticipation of its reassembling, Shaftesbury, as lord chancellor, had issued writs for the election of thirty-six persons to fill vacancies in the house of commons which had occurred in the interval. During the debate on the choice of a

¹ *Shaftesbury Papers*, series ii., no. 236.

² *European Magazine*, vol. xiv. (1788), p. 402; Locke to Mapletoft, 14 Feb., 1672-3.

³ Numerous records of his work in these ways are among the *Shaftesbury Papers*.

speaker, a question arose as to the legality of the proceeding, and the king referred to it in an extempore addition to his opening speech, which perhaps was made in order to blind the house as to his arbitrary conduct in other ways by an affectation of extreme desire to act constitutionally in this respect. "One thing," he said, "I forgot to mention to you, which happened during this prorogation. I did give orders that some writs might issue out for the election of members instead of those that are dead, to the end the house might be full at their meeting, and I am mistaken if this be not done according to former precedents. But I desire that you fall not to any other business till you have examined that particular, and I doubt not but precedents will justify what is done. I am as careful of all your privileges as of my own prerogative."¹ Next day the commons resolved that the writs were void; and accordingly new writs were issued. The debate and decision on this question settled an important point in parliamentary routine, and no discredit attached to Lord Shaftesbury in the matter. That he had endeavoured to act rightly appears from the fact that before issuing his writs the precedents for such action were carefully hunted up. This duty, somewhat an onerous one, appears to have been assigned to Locke, as many of the documents thus prepared were written out, and all now extant were endorsed, by him.²

Another very singular duty devolved upon Locke in connection with the opening of this session of parliament. It was customary in those days for the king's speech to be supplemented by a speech from the lord chancellor,

¹ *Commons' Journals*, 5 Feb., 1672-3.

² *Shaftesbury Papers*, series viii., no. 8.

supplying, paragraph for sentence, whatever expansion, explanation, or justification seemed to be called for by the king's own words. On this occasion Charles the Second referred briefly to the iniquitous attack on Holland as "a most important, necessary, and expensive war," into which he had been forced, not so much by "the indignities to his own person," as by regard for "the interest as well as the honour of the whole kingdom." Shaftesbury, when it was his turn to speak, enlarged on the necessity of the Dutch being attacked by the English; they being, as he said, "the common enemies to all monarchies, and especially to ours, their only competitor for trade and power at sea, and who only stand in their way to an universal empire as great as Rome," and threw on parliament the responsibility of the war. "You judged aright," he said, "that at any rate 'delenda est Carthago.' That government was to be brought down; and therefore the king may well say to you, 'Tis your war.' He took his measures from you, and they were just and right ones."¹ Those words, especially the quotation "Delenda est Carthago," gave offence to many, and were afterwards often quoted as a reproach to Shaftesbury. It appears, however, from the account of Shaftesbury's grandson, that he had prepared a very much more temperate speech, which, on being submitted to the king and the other members of the cabal, was judged by them so weak and inadequate in its allusion to the war that they supplied him with another version, especially insisting on the adoption of Cato's words; that this new version caused him such "great concern and trouble," that he complained about it at the time to Locke and to a relative of Locke's who was also

¹ Christie, vol. ii., appendix, p. lxiv.

a member of the family; and that at last, when he was compelled to utter the speech in its altered form, "he who of all men was esteemed the most ready in speaking was forced to desire Mr. Locke to stand at his elbow with the written copy to prompt him in case of failure in his repetition."¹

Which picture is more incongruous—Locke walking by the side of Lord Shaftesbury's coach and then attending him bareheaded into the house of lords—or Locke standing at Lord Shaftesbury's elbow in the house of lords, with the written speech in his hand, ready to prompt him if he forgot the exact words he was ordered to deliver by the king and the Duke of Buckingham?²

The great debates of this session, in both houses of parliament, were on the declaration of indulgence and the test bill. The king was forced to cancel the declaration of indulgence, and the test bill was passed.

This latter measure, to the surprise alike of the dissenters and of the court, Shaftesbury supported, and with

¹ *Notes and Queries*, vol. iii. (1857), p. 99; Third Lord Shaftesbury to Le Clerc, 8 Feb., 1704-5.

² Just before performing the latter service Locke must, if the story be true, have seen a characteristic specimen of the courtly manners of the time, and of Shaftesbury's audacious humour. To deliver his speech Shaftesbury had, according to precedent, to occupy the seat at the right hand of the throne, which was traditionally assigned, on ordinary occasions, to the Prince of Wales, but which, there being no Prince of Wales, was now appropriated by the Duke of York; and this seat had, before Shaftesbury's arrival, been taken by the duke. "The duke being unwilling to quit his seat," it is added, "Lord Shaftesbury told him he could not proceed upon business till the house was in form. At length the duke was obliged to submit, but said in a passion, 'My lord, you are a rascal and a villain!' He, with great composure, immediately replied, 'I am much obliged to your royal highness for not calling me likewise a coward and a papist.'"—Martyn, 'Life of the First Earl of Shaftesbury' (1836), vol. ii., p. 30.

fair excuse, if not good reason. It seems likely that he now for the first time had intimation of the secret treaty of Dover, and that thus a startling revelation of the real intentions of the king and his catholic advisers was made to him. At any rate he now began to see, as Locke had seen long before and had urged so forcibly in his 'Essay concerning Toleration,' that, while the fullest liberty ought to be allowed to every one in matters of religious opinion and forms of worship, no one ought to be allowed to use a cloak of religion for covering political opinions and actions that were evidently detrimental to the welfare of the state. The catholics of Stuart times clearly came under that category, and the test bill was only designed, albeit somewhat roughly and inadequately, to check the political action of the catholics. It was a bill "for preventing dangers which may happen from popish recusants, and quieting the minds of his majesty's good subjects," by requiring every one holding any civil or military office or public employment of any kind to take the oaths of supremacy and allegiance, to conform to the church of England, and solemnly to repudiate the doctrine of transubstantiation. It set no new burthens upon protestant dissenters, though it did add another link to the chain that parted them from free citizenship; but it struck an effective blow at all the treacherous catholics who were plotting the re-establishment of their religion in England. Therefore Shaftesbury cannot be blamed for helping to pass the measure. By so doing, however, he offended the king, and this was the turning-point in his fortunes.

The first practical issues of the test act were the resignations of the Duke of York, Lord Clifford, and other servants of the crown who were avowed catholics. As a later and more important issue Englishmen began, more

clearly than heretofore, to sink minor differences, and even such great differences as existed between tories and whigs, high-churchmen and puritans, and to divide themselves into anti-catholics and catholics. Shaftesbury became almost, if not quite, the leader of the anti-catholic party.

The session of parliament which began on the 4th of February, 1672-3, was a short one. Pleased at the passing of the test bill, the house of commons readily made a grant for the Dutch war, and winked at the stop of the exchequer; and the king, fearing that some new measure against the catholics might be introduced, ordered an adjournment on the 29th of March, which was afterwards turned into a prorogation. In the interval the great topic that excited men's minds was the marriage then being contracted between the Duke of York, a widower of two years' standing, and Mary of Modena, which was regarded as the presage of new foreign leagues involving wars and other costly complications in the interests of popery. Shaftesbury was regarded as the chief promoter of the ineffectual opposition offered to this marriage when parliament met for another session, on the 7th of October, to be again prorogued, on account of its recalcitrant temper, on the 3rd of November; and on the 9th of the same month he was summarily dismissed from the lord chancellorship.

Locke, of course, lost his secretaryship of presentations at the same time. How much he had to do with Shaftesbury's political movements just then and afterwards does not appear; but, as a great number of the earl's papers referring to those movements bear his endorsements and annotations, and several are altogether in his handwriting, it seems only reasonable to infer that throughout this

period he was his intimate adviser on all subjects about which he chose to take advice, or thought himself justified in confiding so much private information as would make it possible for advice to be given. "When my grandfather quitted the court and began to be in danger from it," said the third Lord Shaftesbury moreover, "Mr. Locke now shared with him in dangers, as before in honours and advantages. He entrusted him with his secretest negotiations, and made use of his assistant pen in matters that nearly concerned the state and were fit to be made public." ¹

Early in Charles the Second's reign a council of trade had been somewhat irregularly established, and in July, 1670, apparently at the instigation of the Earl of Shaftesbury, then Lord Ashley and in the full tide of his prosperity, there had been appointed a council of foreign plantations, to co-operate with it, and generally to inquire into the actual condition of colonial trade and to act as an intermediary between the crown and the colonial governors.² Of this latter council the Earl of Sandwich was president, and John Evelyn was, in February, 1670-1, appointed one of its ten members.³ Between it and the council of trade there seems, however, to have been some confusion, and in September, 1672, the two bodies were formally united, in compliance with Shaftesbury's recommendations, he himself being appointed president.⁴

¹ *Notes and Queries*, vol. iii. (1851), p. 98; Third Lord Shaftesbury to Le Clerc, 8 Feb., 1704-5.

² *Harleian MSS.*, no. 6394, in the British Museum.

³ Evelyn, 'Diary and Correspondence,' vol. ii., p. 55.

⁴ *Colonial State Papers, Entry Book 93*, in the Public Record Office.

With this new council Locke was connected from the beginning, though in what capacity at first is not clear. Numerous documents concerning both the trade and the government of all the West Indian and American colonies, in and after the autumn of 1672, are endorsed by him, thus showing that he was acting as a sort of secretary ; but the actual secretary was Benjamin Worsley until the midsummer of 1673. On Worsley's death Locke was appointed to succeed him with a salary of 500*l.* a year, and he was sworn in on the 15th of October, 1673.¹

That he should have succeeded to this post, as soon as Shaftesbury had it to dispose of, is only natural after all the services that he had rendered towards the establishment of the colony of Carolina. His duties were far more various and responsible than heretofore. He had to deal more especially with the crown colonies, which then were only Virginia, Jamaica, Barbados, and five smaller West Indian islands ; but he had also to watch the affairs of all the other colonies. Four of them belonged to aristocratic proprietors, New York to the Duke of York, New Jersey to Sir George Carteret and others, Maryland to Lord Baltimore, and Carolina to Lord Shaftesbury and his associates. Hudson's Bay and the Bermudas were held by English trading companies ; and the New England settlements, Rhode Island, Connecticut, New Plymouth, and Massachusetts, were governed by local corporations.

Locke had to correspond and communicate with the chief officers of the crown in England and with the colonial governors and governments on all matters of interest, as well as with everybody in England and elsewhere whose colonial affairs needed protection or advance-

¹ *Colonial State Papers, Entry Book, 1670—1674*, in the Public Record Office ; Evelyn, vol. ii., p. 89.

ment, who had recommendations to make or grievances to set forth. He had to investigate all the great and small disputes of colonists among themselves or with the home authorities, and to consider all projects for establishing new settlements or reviving old ones. And now and then he had such momentous topics to write upon as the shifting about of New York between Dutch and English rule, according to the fortunes of war, and the removal of all English settlers from Surinam, which was necessitated by the same war. But in all the voluminous correspondence that is extant there is very little illustration of his personal history; nor is there anything to show how far he acted merely as a secretary, and how far he initiated the proceedings that he had to direct. Of his secretaryship of the council of trade and foreign plantations there is little more therefore to be said—unless we were to review the whole colonial history of the period—than that it evidently engrossed a great deal of his time and attention during about two years, and that all the duties devolving upon him appear to have been performed with scrupulous precision and completeness.¹

In the affairs of Carolina he continued, rather as assistant to Lord Shaftesbury than as secretary to the council, to take especial interest. In 1672, probably shortly before Shaftesbury's promotion, and when his health was so bad that he found change of some sort necessary, he even thought of visiting this and other American colonies. That must be inferred from a letter addressed to him by his friend Sir Peter Colleton, who, besides being greatly interested in Carolina, was a large

¹ Several bundles of documents referring to this period are in the Public Record Office. I have examined them, and found entries and docquetings, in great number, in Locke's writing, but nothing of personal interest.

owner of property in Barbados, where he at that time resided, and a sharer in other colonial enterprises. "I have been long expecting to hear news from you from New England," wrote Colleton from Barbados, "and my Lord Willoughby and I had projects of taking Carolina in our way and visiting you there, but it hath pleased God to dispose things otherwise. He is dead; you, I understand, in employment in England, and I tied by the leg with an office here until his majesty please to release me."¹

"Our friends in Carolina," Colleton added, "sing the same song they did from the beginning; a very healthy, a very pleasant, and fertile country; but great want of victuals, clothes and tools; and I am of opinion the two last ought to be sent them. One supply more of that kind would be enough. Victuals they will be sufficiently furnished with this year, never to want more, and, if we should omit the other two, we may run a hazard of losing all the money we have been out; for, after Barbados had been settled six years, the people, who were then upwards of six hundred men, were leaving it in a humour, and you see what this island is come to; and no doubt, if we hold our ground, but Carolina will excel all other English plantations. Several men of considerable estates will engage from hence as soon as there is peace, and shipping is to be had." In June of the same year we find Joseph West, who went out with the first shipload from England, writing to Locke in a similar strain. More settlers, fresh supplies of clothing and tools; nothing else can "preserve the settlement from falling."² Other letters are to the same effect. "We have had news from Carolina," wrote Colleton in his next letter, "where the poor people had been ex-

¹ *Shaftesbury Papers*, series ix., no. 25; Colleton to Locke, 28 May, 1673.

² *Ibid.*, series ix., no. 26; West to Locke, 28 June, 1673.

posed to very great misery and hardships for want of supplies. One vessel by which they expected them was seven months on a voyage that might have been performed in two months. The other was taken by a Caper. If we can but make them stand until the war be over, we need not doubt the coming to them of most of the people northwards of them. They should presently have a supply of tools, clothes and ammunition sent them.”¹ Events justified the confidence with which, albeit tardily and at great risk, the proprietors, with Locke for their agent, supported the colony till it was able to maintain itself.

But greater than the interest which Locke took in Carolina appears to have been his interest in an offshoot from that colony.

The Bahamas, or Lucayos—one of which, San Salvador, now Cat Island, ought to be remembered as the first halting-place of Columbus in the voyage that issued in the discovery of America—had been desolated by the successors of Columbus, who took all their harmless and defenceless inhabitants to be slaves on the larger West Indian islands or on the continent. It was not until 1629 that the most attractive island of the group, called by them New Providence, was colonised by some Englishmen. In 1661 these colonists were attacked, many of them murdered, and all the rest expelled by the Spaniards, who, however, made no use of that or the neighbouring islands. In or near the year 1666 stragglers from Jamaica and other young colonies began a fresh settlement in New Providence, and its more orderly colonisation was projected by the English authorities.²

¹ *Shaftesbury Papers*, series x., no. 3; Colleton to Locke, 12 Aug., 1673.

² As a curious illustration of the way in which colonising schemes were

On the 1st of November, 1670, the Bahamas were formally given by Charles the Second to the lords proprietors of Carolina, and by them an argreement was, on the 4th of September, 1672, entered into with eleven

prepared in the time of Charles the Second, I extract the following from the *Colonial State Papers, West Indies*, in the Public Record Office. It is not dated, but is among the documents of 1668, and was probably drawn up in 1666 or 1667.

“A short computation of expense in settling and improving the Bahama Islands for the first three years.

It is proposed to transport 300 families, of 1000 persons, their passages, and incident charges at 12 <i>l.</i> per head	£12,000
Their subsistence for six months after their arrival, and furnishing them with tools of all sorts, and other necessaries for building and planting at 25 <i>l.</i> per head	25,000
600 slaves at 30 <i>l.</i> each	18,000
	<hr/>
	£55,000
To recruit and support this settlement for three years, computed at half the first expense	27,500
It is proposed to trade for 4,000 negroes per annum, being 8,000 for the first two years (before any returns can be expected) at 25 <i>l.</i> per head, delivered at Providence	200,000
The like value in goods of the manufacture of Great Britain, etc.	200,000
Charges of agency and sloop hire, and other incident charges to establish a trade and settlement	15,000
Two armed sloops, for three years	6,000
Additional subsistence to the king's garrison of 100 men for three years at 15 <i>l.</i> per man	4,500
Charges at home for three years	5,000
Fortifications already made	40,000
Additional fortifications to be made	50,000
	<hr/>
	£603,000
200 workmen at 25 <i>l.</i> per head wages	15,000
Provisions for ditto	15,000
	<hr/>
	£633,000

“adventurers to Bahamas,” who were to pay 1600*l.* for 12000 acres of land in New Providence, and as much in any other of the islands that they chose, and were to start and carry on a suitable trade between these islands and the mother country.¹

Locke was one of these Bahamas adventurers, and his friend Mapletoft at starting was another, each subscribing 100*l.* towards the 1800*l.* that provided for the purchase-money and other charges incidental thereto. Thomas Stringer, Lord Shaftesbury’s secretary, subscribed 300*l.*; there were five subscribers of 200*l.* apiece, and three others of 100*l.* At the first meeting of the adventurers, however, held at Exeter House, on the 9th of September, Mapletoft was allowed to assign his interest in the stock to Locke; and at the next meeting, on the 23rd of October, Mapletoft’s share was formally transferred to his friend.² Both Locke and Mapletoft, it will be remembered, had gone to France about the middle of September with the Countess of Northumberland, Mapletoft to stay away for a year or two, Locke to return in about three weeks, and soon to be employed both as secretary of presentations to the lord chancellor, and as secretary to the council of trade and plantations. It would seem that, when Mapletoft took his share in the Bahamas venture, he did not expect to be so long away. As soon as his arrangements with Lady Northumberland were made, Locke relieved him of his connection with a business that he could not look after, and thus, having doubled his share in the speculation, became altogether responsible for a ninth of it. The calls afterwards made upon him were doubtless far in excess of the original 200*l.* He was present

¹ *Additional MSS.*, no. 15640, in the British Museum.

² *Ibid.*, no. 15640.

on the 8th of November, at a meeting on board the ship *Bahamas Merchant*, moored in the Thames, and ready for sailing.¹ A good deal of money must have been spent in so promptly fitting out this vessel. But, as only the first minute-book of the Bahamas company is extant, there is not much to be said about the sequel to Locke's enterprise in colonial trade.

"I find I am your partner in the Bahamas trade," Sir Peter Colleton wrote to him from Barbados in May, 1673, "which will turn to account if you meddle not with planting; but if you plant, otherwise than for provision for your factor, you will have your whole stock drowned in a plantation, and be never the better for it. Planting is my trade, and I think I may, without vanity, say I understand it as well as most men; and I am sure I am not deceived in this particular. If other men will plant there (I mean the Bahamas), hinder them not: they improve our province. But I would neither have you nor my lord engage in it."² Colleton evidently meant to say that planting, however profitable if prudently conducted by a resident proprietor, was a hazardous speculation for an adventurer to carry on by deputy at a distance of some thousands of miles; and it is probable that Locke followed his very wise advice.

It is clear, however, that he took considerable interest in Bahamas affairs during these years, and long afterwards. One of his correspondents in New Providence was Isaac Rush, a quaker who had sought in the new

¹ *Additional MSS.*, no 15640.

² *Shaftesbury Papers*, series ix., no. 25; Colleton to Locke, 28 May, 1673. In Barbados, in 1673, there were 29050 acres in cultivation by seventy-two planters. Sir Peter Colleton was one of these planters, and held 700 acres.—*Shaftesbury Papers*, series x., no. 3.

colony more religious freedom than he could get at home. Locke obtained for him some office, and in July, 1673, he sent a letter of humble thanks to "Doctor Locke," with something more substantial than thanks. "I have sent thee," he wrote, "two sugar loaves as an earnest of my future gratitude, which I shall by all opportunities take advantage to signify."¹

Besides following his own Bahamas venture and attending to his duties as secretary of the council of trade and plantations, Locke watched over the affairs of Carolina and the other colonial speculations of Lord Shaftesbury, when Shaftesbury was too busy about state concerns to attend properly to them himself. "I desire you would speak with Mr. Hawkins about the ships at Hudson's Bay, and what hopes there is of either of them returning this year," the earl wrote to him in November, 1674, from St. Giles's, where at that time he thought it safer to reside than in London; "and pray let me know what you hear of the Bahama ships."²

The council of trade and plantations was dissolved by royal mandate on the 12th of March, 1674-5,³ and Locke was relieved from his responsible duties as its secretary. At some time after his appointment in October, 1673, his salary appears to have been raised, on paper, from 500*l.* to 600*l.*; but, if he ever received any of it, it cannot have been for more than fourteen years after his appointment had lapsed. Early in 1689 he tendered to King William a petition representing that "King Charles the Second having conferred on him the secretary's place to

¹ *Shaftesbury Papers*, series x., no. 5; Rush to Locke, 15 July, 1673. In the same bundle there is another letter from Rush, dated 10 August, 1674.

² Christie, vol. ii., p. 61; Shaftesbury to Locke, 23 Nov., 1674.

³ *Colonial State Papers*, *Entry Book*, 97.

the then council of trade and plantations, with the salary of 600*l.* per annum, under the privy seal, and he having attended the said council till 1674"—March 1674-5 would at that time be reckoned the last month of 1674—"without any payment of his salary, he humbly desired payment of the same."¹ The petition, however, was apparently withdrawn by him.

Locke's visit to France in the autumn of 1672 was a very short one, but he found time in it to make acquaintance with one of the most remarkable works that had lately appeared in that country; and, soon after his return, heavy and various as were the duties that devolved upon him, he found time to put into English what were to him the most interesting portions of it.

The work was the 'Essais de Morale,' or so much of the series as had then appeared, by Pierre Nicole, the friend of Pascal. Born in 1625, Nicole had been trained for the church, and was completing his studies at the Sorbonne, and preparing to take his doctor's degree, when previous leanings towards Jansenism became so strong that he abandoned his intended career and retired to Port Royal, five years before Pascal and his yet dearer friend Arnauld went thither. When, in 1655, Arnauld and the other Jansenist doctors were expelled from the Sorbonne, Nicole took an important share, anonymously, in the pamphlet war that ensued. In the following year he helped Pascal and Arnauld in the 'Lettres Provinciales,' which, in 1658, he translated into Latin. He assisted in all the other work of the famous school of catholic reformers, and especially, being like Arnauld a thorough Cartesian,

¹ *Domestic State Papers, Reign of William and Mary, Petitions, 1688.*

in the 'Logique de Port Royal.' The first two volumes of the 'Essais de Morale,' containing ten discourses, were published in 1670 and 1671, and excited an interest only, though greatly, surpassed by that aroused by the 'Pensées' and the 'Lettres Provinciales.' "I read M. Nicole with a pleasure that carries me away," wrote Madame de Sevigné in 1671. "Above all, I am charmed with the third treatise, on the means of preserving peace among men. Read it, I pray you, with attention, and see how clearly he displays the human heart. This is what I call searching the heart to the bottom with a lantern. That is just what he does: he reveals to us what we feel every day, though we have not the wit to distinguish nor the sincerity to confess it. In one word, I never saw such writing as that of these messieurs." Stronger praise came afterwards from a stronger critic. "Pierre Nicole," said Voltaire, "was one of the best of the Port Royalist writers. What he wrote against the Jesuits is little read now-a-days; but his moral essays, which are useful to the human race, will never perish. Above all, the chapter on the means of preserving peace in society is a masterpiece unequalled, in its kind, in ancient literature." Few modern readers will quite agree with Voltaire; but Locke thought so well of these essays that he translated three; one 'On the Existence of God and the Immortality of the Soul,' one 'On the Weakness of Man,' and the famous one 'On the Way of Preserving Peace with Men.'

Locke does not seem to have ever had any thought of publishing these translations. He probably began them merely as an exercise in the study of French, though he was doubtless quite truthful in adducing another reason in a letter which he sent, with the completed translations, to the Countess of Shaftesbury.

This letter, which is undated, but may be referred to the early part of 1673, albeit rather too full of compliment, is a graceful tribute to the worth of a lady about whose goodness there can be no doubt, and for whom it is clear that Locke felt very genuine respect. She had lately become a peeress, and was now wife of a lord chancellor. All her friends were making her presents in token of their affection. Locke's present was very characteristic.

“It was a bold thing,” he said in this letter, “for one that had but begun to learn French to attempt a translation out of it, and it is yet bolder to design it to you. Fashion, which takes the liberty to authorise whatever it pleases, must be my excuse; and, since one is allowed to bring vanity with one out of France, and with confidence to present as marks of respect at home any sort of toys one hath picked up abroad, I now have to make use of my privilege of a traveller, and to offer to your ladyship a new French production in a dress of my own making. This is, I think, to be sufficiently vain; but so must he necessarily be who ever, having obligations like mine beyond all acknowledgment, hopes to make any return; and, since all I can aim at will in this respect amount to but a trifle, there remains no more but that I endeavour to make choice of such a trifle to express my gratitude as may have something in it peculiar and proper to recommend it. When I was at a loss what to pitch on for this purpose, this book came happily into my hands; wherein I found so many characters of your ladyship, that methought, at first view, it bore your mark and did of right belong to you; and when I observed in it so many lively representations of that virtue which is so eminently seen in your ladyship, I thought I could not meet in all France

anything fitter to be put into your hands than what would make you see so rare and extraordinary a sight as a draft of some of your own virtues. For, if to be constantly humble in a high station, if to appear little to yourself in the midst of greatness, be a mark of the sense of one's own weakness—if to be beloved of all that come near you be a demonstration that you know how to live at peace with others—if to be constant and frequent in acts of devotion be the best way of acknowledging a Deity—'tis certain your ladyship is in reality what the author has here given us the idea of." "There was another consideration," Locke added, "that made me think this the properest present I could make. For, since it was not for me to offer at anything of a value fit for persons of your quality, the best way to hide that shame was to find out some ordinary matter that might lessen the esteem of those things that pretend to greatness and preference, and make them appear as inconsiderable as itself. The perusal of these discourses will perhaps do that in a good measure; and I shall be the more excusable in your ladyship's thoughts for presenting you with a little blotted paper, when you, reflecting upon what our author says, shall perhaps think that all the gaudy things of his country are not much better, and scarce worth the bringing over."¹

If there was something of the courtier in Locke, his way of paying court was very different from that of most people.

The chief modern value of these translations is in their illustration of Locke's temper at the time when he prepared them, and in their evidence of the sort of

¹ 'Discourses, translated from Nicole's Essays.' By John Locke. Edited by Thomas Hancock, M.D. (1828), pp. xxiii.—xxvii.

theological writing which he considered useful. Few readers would now-a-days attach much weight to the arguments themselves, especially to those brought forward in the first essay, to prove that there is a God, and that he has endowed man with an immortal soul.

“Prophecies and miracles are much more likely to prevail,” it is here truly said, than “natural proofs” of the sort adduced by Nicole. “Reason, to discover one God, creator of all things we see,” it is urged, “has no more to do but to suffer itself to follow its own natural motion when it considers the progress of nature in an order never disturbed. It is impossible that all this is not the production of some cause which possesses in itself all the perfections which we observe in this most excellent piece of workmanship.”¹ That is the substance of the whole argument: matter must have a cause; and it is convenient to assume that that cause is not itself caused. “What reason can there be to conceive this dull and insensible lump we call matter eternal and without beginning? Is it not evident that there is not anything in it that can be imagined to contribute in the least towards its existence, and that it is extremely absurd to ascribe to the vilest and most contemptible of all beings the highest of all perfections, which is, to be of itself? I perceive myself to be something beyond comparison more excellent than matter. I know it, and it knows nothing of me. But with all this, I know and find at the same time that I have not been from eternity. It follows then that matter, as well as I, must needs have been produced by some cause; which, since it could not possibly be matter, can be no other but

¹ ‘Discourses,’ p. 4.

that immaterial omnipotent Principle we are seeking after."¹

Nicole found it even easier to "prove" the immortality of the soul than to "prove" the existence of God. "We are certain we ourselves think, and cannot doubt it of other men." "There must needs be some being in us which is not matter, but is really distinct from it. What shall be able to destroy this thinking being? The annihilation of anything is to us inconceivable; our reason is directly against it; and nature affords us not one example of it. Why, then, should we do violence to our reason and our imagination to remove these thinking beings out of the common state of all other things, which, having once got existence, never sink again into nothing? Why should we apprehend the annihilation of our souls, which are infinitely nobler than our bodies, when we have no such apprehension of any one body whatsoever?"²

In that shuffling way, assuming everything it suited him to assume, rejecting everything it suited him to reject, refining out of Cartesianism all its strength, and then diluting the residuum, Nicole thought that he proved the existence of God and the immortality of the soul, and Locke thought the "proofs" worth translating into English. Locke acknowledged more than twenty years later, however, that he had not then, or for a long time afterwards, given serious thought to its topic, or rather to the strong arguments thereupon which Nicole here weakly put forward. "Though I had heard Descartes's opinion concerning the being of a God often questioned by sober men and no enemies to his name," he wrote in 1696, "yet

¹ 'Discourses,' p. 5.

² *Ibid.*, pp. 8—10.

I suspended my judgment of him till, lately setting myself to examine his proof of a God, I found that by it senseless matter might be the first eternal being and cause of all things, as well as an immaterial, intelligent spirit."¹ It is clear, then, that if in 1672 or 1673 Locke adopted Nicole's Cartesian exposition, he did it without investigation. It was not often that he indulged in metaphysical inquiries of this sort.

The second essay translated by Locke from Nicole—a sort of sermon from the text, "Have mercy upon me, O Lord, for I am weak"—was less ambitious than the other, but more in harmony with Locke's general line of thought. Its opening paragraphs read as if they were rather his own work than a translation. They enumerate various sorts of pride; among them the pride of grandees. "It consists in the idea they have of their power; but since, in the contemplation of themselves alone, they find not wherewithal to stuff out this mighty idea, they are wont to take in all those that are about them, or belong to them. A great man, in the idea he hath framed of himself, is not one single man, but a man stuck round with all those that depend on him, with as many arms as are all theirs, because he moves and disposes of them. Thus every one labours as much as he can to take up a great deal of room in his own imagination; and men bustle and advance themselves in the world for nothing else but to enlarge this idea which every one makes of himself in his own mind."²

There is not much argument in this essay. After the preliminary condemnation of pride, it is chiefly made up of illustrations and enforcements of the

¹ Lord King, p. 312.

² 'Discourses,' p. 26.

impotence of human nature. "Take the bravest man in the world," we read in one paragraph, "and keep him but two days fasting, and you shall see him languish, almost without motion or thought, wholly taken up with the sense of his own want and weakness. He must have a supply of nourishment to wind up those springs and set those wheels agoing without which the soul cannot perform her operations. What can there be of greater humiliation than this necessity? And yet this is not the most irksome of all, because not the hardest to be satisfied. That of sleep is far otherwise. To maintain our lives we must every day die, resigning up ourselves into a condition void of thought, void of reason, wherein men are not distinguished from beasts, and we pass a great part of our lives in a state wherein we live not at all."¹

But greater than the physical weaknesses of men, we are told, are their mental weaknesses; and, as one illustration of this we have a curious allusion to Descartes. "After men have been teaching and studying philosophy upon divers principles for these three thousand years together, there starts up a little fellow in a corner of the world who changes the whole face of it, and undertakes to show that all those who went before him understood nothing of the principles of nature. Wherein there is something more than empty boasting; for it must be acknowledged that this new philosopher gives us more light into natural things than all the others together. Nevertheless, how happy soever he has been to discover the weakness of the principles in the common philosophy, he has left in his own some obscurities which the wit of man cannot clear up. His doctrine of space, and the

¹ 'Discourses,' p. 47.

nature of matter hath horrible difficulties, and, I fear me, they have more heat than light who declare themselves not startled at them. What greater instance can one have of the weakness of man's understanding than to see that men (and those who seemed, of all others, to have had the strongest parts) have been employed these three thousand years long in the study of nature, and that, after that infinite number of books they have writ on this subject, it was found they understood so little of it, and were so far out of the way, that they are to begin all anew, and that the only benefit one can make of all their works is to learn that philosophy is a vain amusement, and that men know almost nothing?"¹

Throughout his translations Locke gave free and idiomatic rendering, with at the same time a very accurate representation, of the spirit of the original, except in one remarkable instance. "What is there," Nicole asked, "more visibly above the understanding and capacity of men, learned as well as ignorant, than to penetrate into all the depths of religion, to comprehend all its inexplicable mysteries, and thereby be able to resolve all doubts, peremptorily decide all controversies, and, by telling us in short what we are to hold, what we are to reject, put an end to all further inquiries, whereas it exceeds the utmost extent of human understandings to clear some one of those points, and there are single questions which the united knowledge of man would never be able fully to resolve?"² Nicole answered by condemning the protestants;³ but Locke,

¹ 'Discourses,' p. 56.

² *Ibid.*, p. 64.

³ "Que sera-ce donc quand il s'agira de les décider toutes, et de faire le choix d'une religion sur la comparaison des raisons de toutes les sociétés chrétiennes? Cependant les auteurs des nouvelles hérésies ont persuadé cent millions d'hommes qu'il n'y avait rien en cela qui surpassât la force de

instead of translating that condemnation, turned the tables upon his author. "What must it be then," he wrote, "when the business is to rectify the mistakes and silence all the doubts of men of different opinions, and unite all the several churches of Christians into one persuasion upon grounds of truth and evidence? and yet the supporters of an old usurpation persuade the world that there is nothing in all this which exceeds their power; to which they have, by force, compelled so many hundred millions to submit, and have severely handled multitudes that have dared but to question it. 'Tis by this terror, and the threats of hell to boot, upon the least inquiry, the least wavering in this point, that they have held people in subjection; and the hierarchy of Rome, having found the secret of dominion over men's consciences, and considered it as an advantage too great to be parted with, hath always thundered against those that, asserting their just right, have withdrawn from that slavery, and, under the name of heretics, hath treated them as rebels. This monstrous presumption, in those who are really persuaded of such a power amongst them, is the product of human weakness."¹

That contradiction of Nicole's views on one important point is interesting, not only in itself, but also as tending to show that, when Locke followed the text, he substan-

l'esprit des plus simples. C'est même par-là qu'ils les ont attirés d'entre le peuple. Ceux qui les ont suivis ont trouvé qu'il était beau de discerner eux-mêmes la véritable religion, par la discussion des dogmes, et ils ont considéré ce droit d'en juger, qu'on leur attribuait comme un avantage considérable que l'église romaine leur avait injustement ravi. On ne doit pas néanmoins chercher ailleurs que dans la faiblesse même de l'homme, la cause de cette présomption."—'Essais de Morale,' tome i. (1781), p. 37.

¹ 'Discourses,' p. 65.

tially agreed with it. He evidently thought with Nicole that men are altogether weak and contemptible without God, and that, according to the last sentence of the essay, "in him alone they find that light, health and strength which is not to be found either in themselves or any of the creatures about them."¹

The last essay of the three translated by Locke is the longest, and this also has for text a verse of the Bible: "Seek the peace of the city whither I have made you to go, and pray for it to the Lord; for in the peace of it you shall have peace." But its real text is a paragraph of Nicole's own, which Locke translated very neatly: "If we consider, with any attention, the rise of most of the quarrels that happen to ourselves or others, we shall find that they spring commonly from our indiscreet stirring of other men's passions; and justice will make us confess that 'tis very seldom any one speaks ill of us without cause, or takes pleasure to abuse or offend us for naught. We ourselves always contribute to it; and, though there appear no immediate cause, we shall find that we, at a distance, were the occasion. We dispose men, by little indiscretions, to take amiss those things which they would easily endure, if there lay not some grudge at heart that made them touchy. In short, it is almost universally true that, if any one loves us not, 'tis because we have not the skill to make ourselves beloved."² Thereupon follows a fine exposition of the art of worthily making one's self beloved.

Live the best life you can, but live it so as not to give needless offence to others; do all you can to avoid the vices, follies, and weaknesses of your neighbours, but take no needless offence at their divergences from your ideal.

¹ 'Discourses,' p. 97.

² *Ibid.*, p. 103.

That is the doctrine of the essay, and in much of it Locke must have found skilfully set forth the rule of life that he had long ago appointed to himself.

“The faults of others,” we are told very aptly near the close of this treatise, “how great soever, concern only those that have them. They do us no harm, unless we voluntarily take the impression. They are rather objects of pity than anger; and we have as little reason to be displeased with the infirmities of men’s minds as the diseases of their bodies. There is always this odds in the case, that the diseases of their bodies communicate themselves and often infect ours, whether we will or no, whereas the maladies of our minds are not catching without our own consent. We must not only look on the failings of others as diseases, but diseases that we are as liable to as they. There are no faults in others whereof we too are not likewise capable, and, though we are not guilty of the very same, yet perhaps we have those that are greater. So that, not having any reason to value ourselves above others, we shall find that we have none neither to take offence at them.”¹

That, at any rate, the second and third of the essays that he translated from Nicole in the main expressed Locke’s own views on the subjects treated of in them may be fairly assumed; and that at this, as at all other periods of his life, he was thoroughly imbued with a religious spirit, is certain.

It is one of the strangest circumstances in the intellectual history of the later Stuart period, that—while the professional teachers of the established church were, with a few bright exceptions, notorious for their neglect of the sacred duties entrusted to them, except so far as was

¹ ‘Discourses,’ p. 235.

necessary to the maintenance of their own hierarchical supremacy and the monarchical institutions that helped to prop it up; while also, with a few bright exceptions, the dissenters concerned themselves far more with ecclesiastical squabbles than with genuine religious exercises—such men as Locke and Newton and Boyle were the great upholders of Christianity in England. But it was Christian religion, not Christian theology, that they cared for; and, in the case of Locke especially, it was a very broad Christianity indeed.

A short but significant essay or tract, which he not quite appropriately entitled 'Error,' being undated, cannot positively be assigned to this period; but as there was evident consistency in his liberal views on religion, and in his application of them in every-day affairs all through his mature life, it may be appropriately quoted from in this place.

"The great division among Christians," Locke here said, 'is about opinions. Every sect has its set of them, and that is called orthodoxy; and he that professes his assent to them, though with an implicit faith and without examining, is orthodox and in the way to salvation; but, if he examines and thereupon questions any one of them, he is presently suspected of heresy, and, if he oppose them or hold the contrary, he is presently condemned as in a damnable error, and in the sure way to perdition. Of this one may say that there is nor can be nothing more wrong. For he that examines, and upon a fair examination embraces an error for a truth, has done his duty more than he who embraces the profession of the truth (for the truths themselves he does not embrace) without having examined whether it be true or no. For, if it be our duty to search after truth, he certainly that

has searched after it, though he has not found it, in some points has paid a more acceptable obedience to the will of his Maker than he that has not searched at all, but professes to have found truth when he has neither searched nor found it: for he that takes up the opinions of any church in the lump, without examining them, has truly neither searched after nor found truth, but has only found those that he thinks have found truth, and so receives what they say with an implicit faith, and so pays them the homage that is due only to God.”¹

Locke certainly would not consent “to take up the opinions of any church in the lump.” He did not believe in churches, save as organisations and agencies for helping each man to be a good man. That, and that alone he held, is Christianity; that, and that alone, the gospel that has to be preached, the gospel that every one can heed. “A ploughman that cannot read is not so ignorant but he has a conscience, and knows, in those few cases which concern his own actions, what is right and what is wrong. Let him sincerely obey this light of nature. It is the transcript of the moral law in the gospel, and this, even though there be errors in it, will lead him into all the truths in the gospel that are necessary for him to know. For he that in earnest believes Jesus Christ to be sent from God to be his lord and ruler, and does sincerely set upon a good life as far as he knows his duty, where he is in doubt in any matter that concerns himself, cannot fail to inquire of those better skilled in Christ’s law to tell him what his lord and master has commanded concerning that duty which he finds himself concerned in for the regulation of his own actions; for, as for other men’s actions, what is right or wrong as to them, that he is not

¹ Lord King, pp. 281, 282.

concerned to know. His business is to live well with himself and do what is his particular duty. This is knowledge and orthodoxy enough for him, which will be sure to bring him to salvation; an orthodoxy which nobody can miss who in earnest resolves to lead a good life. And therefore I lay it down as a principle of Christianity, that the right and only way to saving orthodoxy is the sincere and steady purpose of a good life."¹

Locke had his own opinions about the truths of Christianity, opinions which some may think unwarranted and others may regard as altogether incomplete. But he maintained that his own opinions and other people's opinions on all matters of faith must be separated from the plain and fundamental and sufficient rule of Christianity, "the sincere and steady purpose of a good life." "Here," he added, "we may see the difference between the orthodoxy required by Christianity and the orthodoxy required by the several sects or, as they are called, churches of Christians. The orthodoxy required by the several sects is a profession of believing the whole bundle of their respective articles set down in each church's system, without knowing the rules of every one's particular duty, or requiring a sincere or strict obedience to them. But"—and the sting is in this last sentence—"it is to be observed that this is much better fitted to get and retain church members than the other way, inasmuch as it is easier to make profession of believing a certain collection of opinions that one never perhaps so much as reads, and several whereof one could not perhaps understand if one did read and study (for no more is required than a profession to believe them, expressed in an acquiescence that suffers one not to question or contradict any of

¹ Lord King, p. 283.

them), than it is to practise the duties of a good life in a sincere obedience to those precepts of the gospel wherein his actions are concerned—precepts not hard to be known by those who are ready and willing to obey them.”¹

There can be no doubt that Locke, being in the best sense of the term a very religious man, had during these years much intercourse with many of the foremost and worthiest religious thinkers, writers and workers of his time—intercourse that must have been all the more congenial because most of these men were no less eminent for their devotion to the best literary and scientific studies of the day than to the duties of their special callings. Of this intercourse we have very few details; but the names and characters of Locke's friends are, for the most part, so well known that we can readily understand their relations without details. His old puritan connections, and his continued devotion to those principles of religious liberty of which he had truer apprehension than even the puritans themselves, appear to have maintained for him some intimacy with Richard Baxter and other leading nonconformists; and, as a representative of a very different school, Edward Pocke, hitherto and still the Oxford divine and scholar whom he most highly honoured, brought him into friendly dealings with many other exceptionally honest and liberal members of the high church party. It was with the latitudinarian churchmen, however, that he evidently had most sympathy. Bishop Wilkins, the sometime presbyterian and Cromwell's brother-in-law, had been one of his teachers at Oxford, and, till his death in 1672, had been his associate in schemes for church comprehension; Wilkins's son-in-law, Tillotson, was his friend through life; and if, as is

¹ Lord King, p. 284.

reported, it was Mapletoft who introduced Tillotson to Locke, Mapletoft may also have brought him into acquaintance with other celebrated Cambridge latitudinarians, especially Simon Patrick and Isaac Barrow. On the occasion of Barrow's death in 1677, we shall find Locke speaking of him as one of his "very considerable friends." The friendship was apparently of long standing. Whether Locke was at this or even at any time personally acquainted with the now venerable leader of the Cambridge school, its leader in its theological and philosophical rather than in its scientific connections, Ralph Cudworth, is not recorded; but the influence of Cudworth and his friends had certainly reached him even while he was an Oxford student, and he was now getting beyond them.

A great haunt of the latitudinarians at that time was, strange to say, the house of Thomas Firmin. "There was hardly a divine of note," says his biographer, "but Mr. Firmin was acquainted with him. This helped him much to serve the interests of many hopeful young preachers and scholars, candidates for lectures, schools, cures, or rectories, for whom he would solicit with as much affection and diligence as other men do for their sons or near relations."¹ Mapletoft spent much time, if he did not when in London reside constantly, in Firmin's house. Many of Locke's letters to Mapletoft were addressed to him "at Mr. Firmin's, over against the George, in Lombard Street," and from allusions in some of these letters it is clear that Locke was himself very intimate with the family.² And Firmin was a man worth knowing.

¹ 'The Life of Mr. Thomas Firmin,' 1698.

² *European Magazine*, vol. xiv. (1788), p. 401; Locke to Mapletoft, 10 Oct. [1671]; and other letters.

A few months older than Locke, and the son of an extreme puritan, he was one of the most prosperous merchants in London. From a Calvinist he became an Arminian. He was the great friend of John Biddle, "the father of the unitarians," whom he helped through his persecution, and he was himself the author of some treatises to prove the unity of God. His most remarkable treatise, however, written in 1678, was entitled 'Some Proposals for the Employment of the Poor and for the Prevention of Begging,' which described and advocated a scheme of useful philanthropy put into practical operation by himself in a warehouse that he erected in Little Britain, and which to us is especially memorable as in part suggesting the system of poor-relief that Locke afterwards propounded.

But here we have chiefly to bear in mind that the excellent unitarian merchant's house in Lombard Street was a famous resort of the latitudinarian churchmen of Charles the Second's time, and that Locke was one of those who frequented it. The friends he made and met there were the friends who helped him somewhat, and whom he must have helped much more, to shake off all the shackles of bigotry, and to find out and prove by their own behaviour that Christianity is not a system of incredible creeds and debasing dogmas, that "the right and only way to saving orthodoxy is the sincere and steady purpose of a good life."

Though the letter that gives us all the details we have concerning Locke's holiday visit to France in September, 1672, was quoted in the last chapter, our review of the more general and miscellaneous incidents of his life hardly reached the beginning of the year.

In January, 1671-2, he received a letter from his friend, John Strachey, which, among other things, helps to show that he was now paying great attention to questions of political economy as well as to all the metaphysical, ethical, and scientific matters that interested him. "I must confess that I have taken too much time to answer your letter," wrote Strachey; "but I hope the holidays and Christmas gambols may be my excuse; which delights, although they come very short of a correspondence with you, yet 'tis a hard matter to shake off custom. As to your three first reasons why taxes should be laid on land, as I write not for dispute but satisfaction, so I acknowledge myself convinced; but as to your fourth, that all taxes terminate at last on the land, I cannot so readily subscribe; for methinks your instances do not reach it, the excise on ale not making barley cheaper, but only less ale is sold for the money, and thereby the printers, and not the countrymen, pay the tax. Indeed, if the statute was put in execution which commands such a quantity to be sold for a penny, then barley must be sold cheaper, else the brewer would not buy it to be a loser by the bargain; but since, as the excise doth rise, he may lessen the quantity of his ale, I can't see why it should fall on barley. So for the rest; and, although you speak never so rationally on this subject, the country will hardly be brought to yield."¹ The country has hardly yielded yet; though much sounder political economists than it was possible for Locke, who

¹ *Shaftesbury Papers*, series ii., no. 217; Strachey to Locke, 19 Jan., 1671-2. "I wish I had your thoughts on a free port," Strachey added in this letter; "for I doubt not but they are very ingenious." Many persons now-a-days also would be glad to know in what way Locke anticipated the modern doctrine of free-trade.

was almost the earliest English economist, to be, have since spoken never so rationally on the incidence of taxation.

We shall have to take some account hereafter of Locke's 'Considerations of the Lowering of Interest and Raising the Value of Money,' which were published in 1691, with a sequel in 1695. In dedicating the first treatise to the friend who urged its publication, he said that it had been partly written long before. "You have put me upon looking out my old papers which have so long lain by and forgotten. Upon this new survey of them, I find not my thoughts now to differ from those I had near twenty years since. They have to me still the appearance of truth." Locke's opinions and arguments can best be described when we have the finished treatise before us; but it is evident that Strachey's letter was in answer to one in which Locke had consulted him about part of the subject handled in the "old papers;" and it is important for us to remember that the matter of the first great contribution made in England to economical science was being thought out in 1671 and 1672, "near twenty years" before 1691.

During the spring and summer of 1672, Locke appears to have resided constantly in London, perhaps assisting Lord Shaftesbury in his political work, and certainly taking a good deal of interest in the business of the council of trade and plantations and other matters relating to the colonies. Having accompanied the Countess of Northumberland as far as Paris in September, he was in London again by the 13th of October.¹

¹ As we find by an entry in his register of the weather. That register was kept up pretty steadily during 1673, but very irregularly during the two following years. "From the beginning of May till the end of July,"

Being at the end of November appointed secretary of presentations, and having thus unusual opportunities for helping any friends who might be in search of preferment, he evidently used his influence in favour of Mrs. Blomer's husband, though at first unsuccessfully, and perhaps on wrong information. "I am in the first place," wrote his "affectionate sister" to him from Aix, "to give you thanks for the favour you intended us upon supposition of Dr. Stillingfleet's removal, and doubt not but the same friendship and kindness which employed your thoughts about that will again represent our concerns to you on the like occasions or any other accident that may give you an opportunity to oblige us. There are few that have a memory so good and faithful for the absent, or that can preserve a steady inclination for persons at our distance, amidst the throng of so many diligent pretenders."¹ Edward Stillingfleet, hereafter to be engaged in long and hot controversy with Locke, was now one of his friends or acquaintances. Born in 1635, he had been helped forward by Lord Shaftesbury, who had procured for him the post of canon residentiary of St. Paul's in 1670. That post he held till 1678, when he was made dean of the same cathedral; but it is clear that there was talk of his being promoted in some way in 1672, and that Locke endeavoured to put Blomer into the vacancy. It was probably with Locke's help that, disappointed in this case, Blomer was made a prebendary of Canterbury on the 6th of August in the following year.²

we read in it concerning 1673, "there was scarce one dry day, but so great rains that produced greater floods than were known in the memory of man."—Boyle, 'Works,' vol. v., p. 150.

¹ *Shaftesbury Papers*, series viii., no. 16; Mrs. Blomer to Locke, 27 Dec., 1672.

² Halstead, 'History of Kent' (1799), vol. iv., p. 620.

Considering Exeter House not large enough, it would seem, for the dignity he wished to keep up as lord chancellor, Shaftesbury appears to have been anxious to obtain the use of Northumberland House, which had been generally shut up since the last earl's death in 1670, and to have employed Locke as his agent in the negotiations. "As to the business of Northumberland House," wrote Mrs. Blomer, "I suppose I need not say much to persuade you to believe that my lady will in this and all things else show her readiness to gratify the desires of so good a friend as my lord chancellor. Her ladyship has given her full consent as far as it is significant, and I am confident she wishes she had had right and authority enough to have made it a complete courtesy." Others with more power than Lady Northumberland, however, must have opposed the arrangement, as the great house in the Strand was never tenanted by Lord Shaftesbury; and, though her ladyship consented, she seems not to have been quite pleased that Lord Shaftesbury's request only came to her through Locke and Mrs. Blomer. "It is expected," wrote the latter, in a postscript to her letter, "that either your lord or lady should say something to my lady themselves concerning Northumberland House. Make use of this hint, and let it not be known from whence you have it; though I am not to tell you what the rules of decency and civility are, and how far they prevail with ladies."¹

That letter contains nearly the last trace we have of Mrs. Blomer. Its business-like tone suggests that the unusually affectionate relations between her and Locke were dying out; but it may not have been so, and

¹ *Shaftesbury Papers*, series viii., no. 16; Mrs. Blomer to Locke, 27 Dec., 1672.

numerous other letters, now lost, may have passed between them in the ensuing years, or, as the Blomers must have left the Countess of Northumberland in August, 1673, to settle down near Canterbury Cathedral, personal intercourse may have superseded much letter-writing. At any rate, we almost lose sight of Mrs. Blomer after February, 1672-3, when Locke, in the postscript of a letter to Mapletoft, said, "Pray tell the doctor and his wife that Mrs. Grigg and the little *femme* are well, and present my service to her."

Either Locke wrote very few letters during the time following his short holiday in France, or an unusually large proportion of those which he did write have disappeared. Only two of any interest are extant for a period of nearly five years. The first of these, written to Mapletoft in October, 1672, has already been quoted. The second, addressed to the same friend five months afterwards, was as follows:—

"DEAR SIR,—‘Petimusque damusque vicissim’ is no unuseful rule in friendship, or, if it be, I think I have taken a sure course to convince you that I was not angry at the slowness of your congratulation, since I have not been hasty to chide you for it, and things are now come to that pass that I fear I shall be thought the guiltier person of the two. I have a great deal to say in my excuse, and should no doubt use a pretence of business, the confusion and disorder of new affairs to a man not versed in the world, and a thousand things of this nature, which you, who have nothing, I hope, to do but enjoy the fair day of a constant spring, may easily think on. Some such pretences, I say, I should offer to you in defence of my silence, did I not consider you as my assured friend, who were not to be got or lost at the rate of a few words, or would not think favourably of me when I did not speak for myself. And I doubt not you have done by my acknowledgment as I did by your good wishes, for I assured myself of them before they came, and stayed not for the post or the packet-boat to receive that satisfaction. Could I as easily bring hither all that I value in France as I could those kind thoughts, you had perhaps lost now and then a sunshiny

day this winter, and would at this moment more want a frieze coat than a parasol. But I will not tell you how fast it snows here now, lest you should grow too fond of Aix, and think London an ill habitation. But I hope the sun, who hath made you almost forget your own country, will revenge us on you, and drive such runagates very shortly from his neighbourhood. This, I confess, is a little harsh to be said; but what would you have a man do, whose fingers ache with cold whilst he is writing to those who brag of warmth and sunshine, and wantonly reject and repel those rays every day which we see not once a fortnight?

“But, to be serious with you, I rejoice heartily at the health you have all found in that temperate climate. I wish the whole journey may have the same success, and return you safe to us, who long for you in England. I enjoy my part of your delicate evenings, and there is nothing about me that is not the better for it but my lungs. I know not how they will hold out; but this I found, that my voyage to Paris did not a little mend them. For that, and the kind intentions farther, I must never forget to pay my most humble thanks to the best lady in France, which I desire you to do in your best words, with my service to the little lady. . . .

“Dr. Sydenham and I mention you sometimes, for we do not now meet often, my business now allowing me but little leisure for visits; but I hope I shall in a short space bring it to better terms.

“Here is a friend of mine, troubled with a paralytic distemper, solicits me to desire you to procure him from the part of France you are in some of the Queen of Hungary’s water, which he hears is best made thereabouts. If you can get him three or four quarts, and send it to London by the way of Marseilles, or ship it at any other port, you will much oblige me. The use and effects of it here would be worth your inquiry; and if you can inform yourself concerning Bourbon waters, how to be taken, in what diseases, and with what success, you may possibly bring home with you a new use of our Bath waters, for which I would thank you.

“I continue my request to you for some sweets, as gloves and perfumes, out of those parts, when you come away, but would not cumber you, for road and carriage I know will be scarce.

“My service to all the good company, and be assured that I am, dear sir, your most affectionate, sincere, and humble servant,

“J. LOCKE.”¹

¹ *European Magazine*, vol. xiv. (1788), p. 402; Locke to Mapletoft, 14 February, 1672-3. “The best lady in France” was the Countess of North-

That Locke kept up his interest in medical affairs may be inferred from the last important paragraph in that letter; but, being too busy even to see much of Sydenham just then, he evidently had no time in which to follow Sydenham's calling.

With the Royal Society he had now even less to do than ever. He was present, it is true, at a meeting at Gresham College on the 6th of November, 1672, when, it is recorded, mention being made of an experiment showing that a sulphur ball possessed considerable attractive powers and represented the properties of the earth, "Mr. Locke intimated that himself had made some experiments with such a ball, and promised that he would bring it to the society at the next meeting."¹ But at the next meeting, on the 13th of November, "Mr. Locke, being called upon for his sulphur ball, which he had promised at the last meeting to produce at this, excused himself that he had forgot it, promising to bring it at the next."² At the meeting held a fortnight later, however, his sulphur ball was not even mentioned, while Boyle exhibited one instead. On the 30th of November, Locke was for the second time chosen to serve on the council, along with Pepys and Evelyn, and he was sworn in on the 18th of December; but he does not appear to have attended any of its subsequent meetings, and he was not re-elected in the following year. The only other reference to him

umberland. The "little lady," elsewhere spoken of by Locke as "Lady Betty," was Lady Elizabeth Percy, her only child, now about five years old, and the last of all the famous Percy family. I have omitted a paragraph referring to some private affairs of Mapletoft's which are not now intelligible. A short postscript has been quoted above.

¹ Birch, 'History of the Royal Society,' vol. iii., pp. 59.

² *Ibid.*, vol. iii., p. 61.

³ *Ibid.*, vol. iii., pp. 64, 69, 112.

in the minutes of the society for three years is one showing that in October, 1673, on examination of the accounts, to see who paid their subscriptions regularly, he was named as one of fifty-seven "who may he looked upon as good paymasters."¹

But, though he was too busy to give as much attention as he was wont to scientific and kindred pursuits, Locke showed during these years all his old zeal in collecting every sort of curious and interesting information to which he had access. This appears, as well as from other sources, from several welcome letters written to him by an old college friend, William Allestree, a kinsman of the Dr. Richard Allestree, who was made canon of Christ Church in 1660, and provost of Eton in 1666,² and who, as we have seen, took a leading part in refusing the degree of doctor of medicine to Locke in 1670. Young Allestree was a student of Christ Church, who, like Locke, did not care to strengthen his footing in the college by taking holy orders. He preferred law and politics. In January, 1667-8, we find him at Montpellier, lately come from Paris, where he had been studying civil law,³ and in the summer of 1669 he was holding some subordinate diplomatic employment in Holland.⁴ In June or July, 1672, Locke obtained for him, through influence with Sir Joseph Williamson, the secretaryship to Sir Edward Wood, then ambassador to Sweden, which had entered into more important relations with England since the negotiation

¹ Birch, 'History of the Royal Society,' vol. iii. p. 94.

² Wood, 'Athenæ Oxonienses,' vol. iii., col. 1269.

³ *Domestic State Papers, Reign of Charles the Second*; Allestree to Secretary Williamson, 8-18 Jan., 1667-8.

⁴ *Ibid.*; Allestree to Robert Francis, 5 Aug., 1669; and Allestree to [? Williamson], 29 Aug., 1669.

of the Triple Alliance. In August he wrote to Locke, thanking him for that service, and announcing his arrival at Stockholm,¹ and this letter was followed by others during the next three years. Some extracts from them will show what sort of use Locke made of his friends abroad, and what sort of news they collected for him.

From Allestree he appears to have sought especially for all sorts of information about Scandinavian antiquities, customs, and superstitions. "As for the witches to whom you desire to be better known," we read in one letter, "I have no acquaintance with them, because they, as upon examination they confess, cannot possibly get into Stockholm, and I am resolved not to go out to them. I am promised a copy of the last trial of them, which if I obtain, as soon as it can be translated you shall have it. Things of this nature are hard to be got, as being forbidden to be communicated upon the account that the silly commonalty, which will still be reading them, oft fancies from thence things tending to its own prejudice." "I have a map to send you," Allestree added, "wherein is represented by picture the manner how the Laplanders worship Old Nick, with several other customs in use amongst them. The history of Lapland hath lately been writ in Latin by a priest who lived long in that country, but you will easilier get it in England than I can here, for it is now printing at Frankfort. It is not only in Lapland, but also in these parts, that the country people drink the healths of God the Father, of their king, and that of their wives; and then, whilst one drinks, the rest of the company sing these words, 'If these three be our friends, we care not for our enemies.'"²

¹ *Shaftesbury Papers*, series ii., no. 228; Allestree to Locke, 16 Aug., 1672.

² *Ibid.*, series viii., no. 17; Allestree to Locke, 16 June, 1673.

“I have a relation of witches in the Swedish tongue,” wrote Allestree a month later, “but, for my life, cannot get it translated. As much as I am able to comprehend it, it contains as extravagant stories as ever were told in a chimney corner by an old woman in winter nights in England. The bearer of this will be able to give you a good account of witches, as living very near Norway, where the witches are as learned as in Lapland.”¹ “I had acknowledged the receipt of yours of October the 9th long since,” he wrote in January, 1673-4, “had I not been trilled on in a constant expectation of being brought acquainted with the first magistrate appointed for the judging of witches, from whose information I hoped in some measure to be able to answer your demands concerning them; but, he continuing still up the country, I cannot learn anything certain here, where the stories and opinions about those things are so different. The ‘History of Lapland,’ which treats of what you desire to be informed, is now out, written by Mr. Schafferus. What he says there concerning the devil and witches is collected out of the king’s own library and the most authentic papers of that nature. If you cannot find the book in London, let me but know it, and I will send you it from hence. I hope you have before this time received the picture and Lap boots.”²

Whether Locke ever obtained the book about Lapland does not appear, but the picture reached him and the boots were lost in the wreck of the ship by which they were consigned.³ “You may see that, though their makers are accounted witches because they cannot sink,”

¹ *Shaftesbury Papers*, series ii., no. 254; Allestree to Locke, 14 July, 1673.

² *Ibid.*, series ii., no. 275; Allestree to Locke, 7 Jan., 1673-4.

³ *Ibid.*, series viii., no. 19; Allestree to Locke, 16 Feb., 1673-4.

Allestree wrote on hearing of this, "yet the boots who did so are honest. If the ship which carried them had not let in water, I am confident they would have held it out; and had the vessel been in them, it had been safer than they were, being in it; for they were made of an elk's skin with the hair outwards, which doth defy both wet and cold; and though the ill success I have hitherto had in addressing things to merchants doth discourage me, yet, if in a short time I can find no particular person to send them by, I will convey a pair of them, together with Schafferus, by Mr. Sowton, to you."¹

As we have not Schafferus, we may be glad of the information on the subject furnished by Allestree in a long paragraph of this same letter. "Sir Edward Wood and I," he wrote, "went lately about half a mile from hence to see a colony of Laps, who with their elks, under a mossy rock, have been planted here all this summer; but hey will shortly be trudging, as fearing the moderate winter of this climate may do them harm. The French ambassador would willingly have kept two of their boys; but the parents would by no means suffer it, as looking on all service to be slavery, and they will rather with their hands cut their children's throats than leave them behind them. I saw two of them fight the other day. Their way of challenging and entering into the lists was, each of them with a stick drew a line upon the ground before him, which he who passed over first did give the signal to war, and so enter into the *champ de bataille*. Being thus advanced, the parties on both sides let the combatants singly determine the war without meddling with them in the least, which was done by the younger

¹ *Shaftesbury Papers*, series ii., no. 279; Allestree to Locke, 23 Sept., 1674.

of them becoming conqueror, who triumphed over his vanquished foe by leaping and shrieking and all other expressions of joy imaginable, whilst the standers-by sided all with the victor, laughing, shouting, and hanging upon his neck, especially the women, and left the unfortunate warrior alone to bewail his miserable defeat and ruminate upon his loss of honour. I will do my utmost to inform you and myself more concerning their witchcrafts, though the gentleman from whom I was to expect it is gone with the army into Germany; and you cannot conceive how closely they keep up all relations of that nature here, much apprehending the hurt they might do, if once divulged amongst the common people. That person by whom I was to have been informed speaks French; so that could I have met with him, I should have had the whole relation by word of mouth; but now I have no other but one given me in Swedish, which I cannot get translated, there being no Englishman here who hath time and Swedish enough to do it. I persuaded one to undertake it, who after some days brought it me back again and swore the very reading of it had so frightened and disturbed his rest that for the whole world he would not undertake the translating of it."

Whatever became of that exciting document, Allestree wrote afterwards to say that he had procured another one, recounting the witch trials of the latter part of 1674, and hoped to have an English translation of it ready within a week. "Though I have not spoke with the judge who is yet up in the country," he added, "yet I have lately talked with one who hath discovered the thing at large with him. I find the judge is of opinion that very few or none of them are really possessed with the devil, but that all their extravagances proceed from a distempered

brain, ill diet, and a constant conversation among themselves wherein they prepossess their fancies with the discourses of devils and witchcraft. The pretended possessed are generally young children, who say the devil is brought to them and they bewitched by old women in the neighbourhood, which they name, who, when they are both confronted before the judge, talk of a gentleman in pantaloons, who uses them kindly, of great leaping, of flying about in the air, and resting sometimes upon weather-cocks, and such like things, as some of our students in Bedlam relate. But this is observable, that neither the young nor the old ones do any hurt either to man or beast, but are a sort of poor silly people, who have taken up a very beggarly trade.”¹

“Formerly, upon this subject,” Allestree continued in this letter, “I told you the devil had declared he had not power to come into this town; but the great want of provisions in the country, I am afraid, hath forced him hither. For the other day, under my window, there was a great young strapping jade who played the possessed by howling, kicking, sprawling, and making wry faces, whilst three of the plot who were with her kept her down, and, lying upon her breast, endeavoured either to crush the devil out again or make his lodging uneasy. By this time a great crowd of people were gathered about her, who immediately began to sing psalms, which being a music Satan likes not, he left his prize; which yet seemed not to be fully herself again till most of the company had given her money, to dispossess her pocket; which had so wonderful an effect that she looked as merrily as if by that means she had conquered the enemy of all mankind.

¹ *Shaftesbury Papers*, series ii., no. 285; Allestree to Locke, 14 April, 1675.

But I hear since that time she is sent to the correction house, and there I leave it to you to think how well the devil will like whipping, etc.”

That is the last of the letters written from Stockholm by Allestree to Locke which has come down to us. It and those preceding it contain a good deal of other matter referring to current politics and the like, but perhaps their gossip about witches was more entertaining to Locke than any other portions of them.

For Allestree's presents of Lap boots and other articles Locke made suitable return. "I thank you for your seasonable present of usquebagh," Allestree said in one letter, "which is excellent, and by warming both me and my friends may save Sir Edward a great deal of firing. I really acknowledge all your favours," he added in the exaggerated phraseology of the time, "and, as I look upon it as the best mark of my judgment and good sense that I esteem and honour you, so I never put any value upon myself, but when I consider you have blest me with your friendship, and thereby made me so eminent in the world as to be your most obliged and humble servant."¹

In this letter Allestree renewed an often-made request for Locke's influence to procure him advancement in the diplomatic service. As Sir Edward Wood's recall from Stockholm was expected, Allestree was anxious to succeed him, not with the title and dignity of ambassador, but as a resident plenipotentiary of some sort. "Had I but the least shadow of hopes of any preferment in England agreeable to my inclinations, as well as my education, I would be as far from that desire as I am now from home; but rather than come to

¹ *Shaftesbury Papers*, series ii., no. 279; Allestree to Locke, 23 Sept., 1674.

London and there be out of business, or go to Oxford and there be pressed to enter into a profession which the very reverence I have for it persuades me to decline, I would stay here and, like the Laps, enjoy that poor content in a cold climate which is not to be had in a more moderate one. There can be no secular fortune in England which may be fit for me, or I for it, which (though of a very moderate value) I should not much rather embrace than this which I here propose; but, if I should be out of the king's service here, or out of all business at home, I may be pressed to the bad choice of either taking orders or leaving what I possess in Christ Church." Whether Locke was able to help his friend, or what became of Allestree after 1675, is not on record. Locke's long sojourn in France seems to have quite parted them.

While receiving curiosities and out-of-the-way information from his friend in Sweden, Locke collected other curiosities and out-of-the-way information from his friends in America and the West Indies. "By the last fleet I sent you a parcel of Carolina china-root," wrote Sir Peter Colleton from Barbados, in 1673, "and by this I send you a jar of this country tar, which I think is oil of bitumen, of whose sanative quality some here talk wonders. I have known the oil of it help the sciatica, and it, with white lily roots, hath cured the glanders in several of my horses. I also send you a pot of tarara-root, which is the root which cures the wounds made by the Indians' poisoned arrows, which was first discovered by Captain Walker, a kinsman of mine. An Indian that had accidentally pricked his thumb with an arrow, being at sea, and having none of this root, gave himself over for dead, and his hand swelled extremely. Major Walker,

being with him, found amongst his things a small piece of the root, at the sight of which the Indian rejoiced extremely; and, chewing and applying some of it to the wound, and swallowing another part, put a stop to the swelling, and when he came on shore, being brought to a garden where Walker had formerly planted some, by the fresh juice of that root quite cured his thumb in a very short time. I find amongst the people it hath an extreme high reputation; but our doctors, who think it not for their profit that any should have the power of healing but themselves, are infidels; yet some have confessed to me that the sediment of the juice, dried and powdered, is a most forcible diaphoretic." Colleton related several instances in which the drug was reported to have effected remarkable cures, and added, "If this root have the virtues I have written, I have sent you a treasure."¹ Locke doubtless agreed with him, and, seeing that his friend Sydenham was just now proving the immense value of the Cinchona or Peruvian bark as a cure for ague, we can understand how eagerly he must have tested the qualities of this new specific.

Besides inviting information on all scientific and kindred subjects from his own correspondents abroad, Locke carefully extracted anything that interested him from the official correspondence that came under his notice through his connection with the colonies. One of these extracts may be given as a specimen. It is endorsed by him, "Ambra Grisia," and is taken from a letter addressed by Richard Lilburne, in New Providence, to the Bahamas adventurers, of whom Locke was one. "Commonly after a storm," we here read, "the coasters for ambergris go to Bahama, Abico, Eleutheria, etc., where

¹ *Shaftesbury Papers*, series x., no. 3; Colleton to Locke, 12 Aug., 1673,

most hath been found. They travel some hundred miles upon the bays, sometimes, before they find any. It seems by the figure to have taken root upon some rocks of the sea, and the violence of the weather makes a separation, which you will perceive by the great piece I have sent. Most that they vend here is real; but the Floridans use great deceit, and are extreme dexterous in its sophistication, yet one may discover it by the want of the grain which is found in right ambergris. That is counted best which is grey or of a nutmeg colour, with a good full grain, and will stick to one's tooth like wax. The scent may be easily fictitious. The taste may make a good trial by them who have been long acquainted with it. The blackness on the outside is no prejudice: the best is so sometimes."¹

By the same ship Locke himself received a letter from Lilburne, treating of various colonial matters. "I have not met with any rarities worth your acceptance," wrote this correspondent, "though I have been diligent in inquiring after them. Of those which I have heard of, one seems strange to me. The fish which are here are many of them poisonous, bringing a great pain of their joints which eat them, and continue so some short time; and at last, with two or three days' itching, the pain is rubbed off. Those of the same species, size, shape, colour, taste, are one of them poison, the other not in the least hurtful; and those that are, only to some of the company. The distemper to men never proves mortal. Dogs and cats sometimes eat their last. Men which have once had that disease upon the first eating of fish, though it be those that are wholesome, the poisonous

¹ *Shaftesbury Papers*, series x., no. 5; Lilburne to the Bahamas Adventurers, 9 Aug., 1674.

ferment in their body is revived thereby, and their pain increased.”¹ Locke thought this information of sufficient interest to be communicated to the Royal Society in May 1675, and the short memoir was published in the next number of the *Philosophical Transactions*.²

We know more through their correspondence of Locke's relations at this time with his friends at a distance than with those near at hand.

From John Strachey he received in February, 1673-4, a somewhat mysterious letter, which was evidently written from Sutton. Neither the young lady who was so sensible and considerate in her dealings with her lovers, nor the “Mr. Co.” whom she so cautiously rejected, nor the young knight to whom Locke appears to have been so anxious to marry her, can be identified. Strachey's style seems formal for so old a friend.

“Sir,—I have received your three letters, and it was not through neglect but choice that I made no speedier an answer; for it was till now before the young lady could come to any resolution, and truly, as the case stands with Mr. Co., she is not at all blameworthy; for, though she might be fixed against the marriage, yet she thought it would have been very inhumanly done to have been instrumental to his relapse. But, now she thinks he is able to endure a denial, she intends to break through all difficulties, and to let him know what he must trust to. As for the young knight, she likes his character and doth not except against the particular, neither doth her uncle Buckland, who was here this day; but whether they may like one another upon the interview is hard to prophesy. I find her backward to go to London, lest it be thought she goes a-wooing, otherwise you know she intended it. But I can't imagine how you will satisfy her in that scruple of honour.

“The particular of her estate I shall not now send you, because I am a person too much concerned, there being some question in law between us;

¹ *Shaftesbury Papers*, series x., no. 5; Lilburne to Locke, 6 Aug., 1674.

² *Philosophical Transactions*, vol. x., p. 312; Birch, ‘History of the Royal Society,’ vol. iii., p. 220.

but, that they may be fairly ended, I intend to bring my writings to London and to stand to the judgment of the best lawyers; yet I do not say but that I may do more than what the law will force me to. Truly I do not exactly know her concern at Sydcott, and therefore I think Mr. Buckland would be the fittest man to send a particular. In sum, I believe her fortune may well answer the knight's estate, and I shall speak to Mr. Buckland, and inform you better hereafter. This is all at present, from, sir, your most humble servant,

“JO. STRACHEY.”¹

For a bachelor, devoted to medical and philosophical studies, zealous in all sorts of public business, Locke certainly had a good deal to do in match-making and assisting the matrimonial affairs of his friends.

Either just before or a few months after receiving Strachey's letter, Locke obtained the bachelorship of medicine at Oxford. The degree was granted, according to one authority, on the 6th of February, 1673-4;² according to another, on the 27th of June, 1674.³ In January, 1674-5, he was appointed to one of the two medical studentships at Christ Church, and it was then expected by his college acquaintances that in the following spring he would become a doctor of medicine.⁴

It is unfortunate that we have not fuller information on these points. It will be remembered that Locke had made two futile efforts, one in 1666 and another in

¹ *Shaftesbury Papers*, series viii., no. 18; Strachey to Locke, 10 Feb., 1673-4.

² 'Catalogue of Oxford Graduates,' p. 418.

³ Wood, 'Fasti Oxonienses,' part ii., col. 343.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 'Letters of Humphrey Prideaux to John Ellis' (Camden Society, 1876), p. 34. I am indebted to Mr. Maunde Thompson, the editor of the latter volume, for allowing me to use its proof sheets before publication. "Locke hath wriggled into Ireland's faculty place," Prideaux, afterwards the famous theologian and no friend to Locke, wrote on the 7th of February, 1674-5, "and intendeth this act to preceede doctor in physic."

1670, to obtain the doctorship of medicine, without complying with the ordinary rules as regards residence at Oxford, attendance at lectures, and so forth; also that in 1666 the king had excused him from the necessity of taking holy orders as a condition of retaining his Christ Church studentship, and that in 1670 Lord Ashley had asked that the next faculty studentship in medicine which fell vacant might be assigned to him. We may perhaps assume that the dean and chapter, without any very friendly feeling towards Locke, had assented to that suggestion, as thus the irregular arrangement ordered by the king would be dispensed with. He did not take the doctorship at the time expected or at any later date; and there is nothing to show whether the bachelor's degree was conferred upon him by favour or by right. It was the doctor's degree that had formerly been refused to him, and that he most desired. The formalities prescribed for the bachelorship were of course less onerous. He may have so nearly complied with them long before, while steadily residing at Oxford, that he had been able to complete the routine at subsequent intervals, and could now take the degree in the regular way. It seems more likely, however, that anticipating the time when he would succeed to a studentship, the Christ Church authorities granted the degree, because it was customary for a faculty student to be at any rate a bachelor, if not a doctor, of medicine.

That Locke was not at this time doing much medical work is clear. From an apothecary's bill for medicines supplied to Lord Shaftesbury's household in 1673, amounting to 3*l.* 12*s.* 6*d.*, it appears that nearly all the drugs compounded were "by Dr. Sydenham's order,"—even "a pot of ointment" for eighteenpence and two

“purging potions” for three and sixpence each, sent to “Mr. Locke’s boy.” Only two or three “cordial mixtures” were made up “by Mr. Locke’s order.”¹ If Locke had not time to prescribe for his own page, and if Sydenham had to replace him as family physician at Exeter House, it is not likely that he practised as a doctor elsewhere.

“Mr. Locke’s boy” was retained in the Shaftesbury household while Mr. Locke himself was away. “Your boy Jack continues still in my lady’s favour, and is much the better beloved for his old master’s sake,” wrote Stringer to Locke, when he was in France.²

If the boy was “beloved for his old master’s sake,” the master himself was not forgotten at St. Giles’s. Lord Shaftesbury was not ungrateful for the many services rendered to him by Locke; and one instance of his kindly feeling must here be given. Of course Locke’s salary of 300*l.* a year as secretary of presentations lapsed with Shaftesbury’s removal from the chancellorship, and though as secretary to the council for trade and foreign plantations he was entitled to 500*l.* or 600*l.* a year, that salary, as we have seen, was not paid. He seems to have alluded to this, and perhaps also to the pending abolition of the office, in a letter written to Shaftesbury in November, 1674. “I am sorry you are like to fare so ill in your place; but you know where your company is ever most desirable and acceptable,” Shaftesbury wrote back. “Pray let me see you speedily, and I shall be ready to accommodate you in your annuity at seven years’ purchase, if you get not elsewhere a better bargain; for I

¹ *Shaftesbury Papers*, series ii., no. 216.

² Christie, vol. ii., p. 220; Stringer to Locke, 10 Feb., 1675-6.

would have you free from care, and think of living long and at ease.”¹ Shaftesbury accordingly arranged to pay Locke an annuity of 100*l.* a year on favourable terms. “This annuity,” it is said in an anonymous and undated, but doubtless authentic, note among the papers of the Shaftesbury family, “was not a mere gift, for Mr. Locke paid money for it; but it was done in this manner: Mr. Locke mentioning one day to Lord Shaftesbury his having a sum of money by him which he knew not well how to dispose of, Lord Shaftesbury said to him, ‘Give me your money, and I will grant you such an annuity as shall make your circumstances easy;’ which he did accordingly. Mr. Locke, as I have been informed, paid not above half, or a little more, than the worth of such a rent-charge, which he received till his death.”²

Shaftesbury’s contribution in Locke’s annuity was not too great a return for the services that had been rendered to him. But Locke’s tastes being simple, this augmentation of his income doubtless sufficed to keep him, as far as money was concerned, “free from care.”

That must have been satisfactory to him, for he was evidently now in frequent alarm lest it should not be possible for him to do much more work. Though his chest and lungs may not have been in a more delicate state now than a few years before, it would appear that about the time when he arranged with Shaftesbury concerning the annuity, he was suffering from a fresh malady, the exact nature of which is not stated. Our only positive information about this is derived from a memorandum addressed to him by Sydenham, which, though undated, was probably written in the autumn of 1674.

¹ Lord King, p. 35; Shaftesbury to Locke, 23 Nov., 1674.

² *Shaftesbury Papers*, series viii., no. 28.

“Your age, ill habit of body, and approach of winter concurring,” wrote Sydenham, “it comes to pass that the distemper you complain of yields not so soon to remedies as it would do under contrary circumstances. However, you may not have the least doubt that a steady persisting in the use of the following directions, grounded not on opinion, but uninterrupted experience, will at last effect your desired cure.” Sydenham then recommended that some medicine—for which the prescription must have been given at some previous time—should be taken “twice a week, as, for example, every Thursday and Sunday, about four o’clock in the morning,” and that other medical treatment should be adopted. “In the next place, forasmuch as there is wanting, in bodies broken with business and disquieted upon the before-mentioned accounts, that stock of natural heat which should bring the matter quickly to digestion, ’twill be highly necessary that you cherish yourself as much as possibly you can by going to bed very early at night, even at eight o’clock, which, next to keeping bed, that is impracticable, will contribute more to your relief than can be imagined. As to diet, all meats of easy digestion and that nourish well may be allowed, provided they be not salt, sweet, or spiced, and also excepting fruits, roots, and such like. For wine, a total forbearance thereof, if it could possibly be, and in its stead the use of any mild small beer, such as our lesser houses do afford, would, as near as I can guess, be most expedient; for thereby your body would be kept well, and consequently all accidents proceeding from hot and sharp humours grating upon the part kept off.” “This,” he said in conclusion, after giving other directions, “is all that I have to offer to you, and I have thought of it, and all circumstances relating to your case,

with the same intention of mind as if my life and my son's were concerned therein."¹

If that document furnishes very welcome illustration of the way in which Sydenham blended the offices of friend and physician in his consideration of, and his advice concerning, the ailment of the friend and physician who consulted him, it painfully confirms the information, more vaguely derived from other sources, as to the poor state of Locke's health at this time.

So long as Locke had to conduct the affairs of the council of trade and plantations, it was clearly impossible for him, however "broken with business," to keep his bed altogether, and the best he could do was to go to rest every evening at eight o'clock, and diet himself very carefully. When the council was dissolved in the spring of 1675, it became easier for him to take, or seek, more complete relaxation, and soon after that he resolved to pay a long visit to France, and to spend some time at Montpellier, the great French health resort.

Though he was in London on the 14th of June,² he probably passed some time at St. Giles's before as well as after that date. He was there at any rate in September, assisting Lord Shaftesbury in arranging for an action at law against Lord Digby, who, counting too much on his loss of favour at court, had grossly libelled him.³ He was also in other ways helping Shaftesbury, who—now altogether alienated, for some time at least, from the

¹ *Shaftesbury Papers*, series viii., no. 2.

² On that day he made the last entry, for nearly six years, in his register of the weather.—Boyle, 'Works,' vol. v., p. 151.

³ Christie, vol. ii., p. 215. Among the *Shaftesbury Papers* there are several documents referring to this matter, which appear to have escaped the notice of Mr. Christie—one of them a long and partly defaced letter from William Fanshawe to Locke, dated 14 September, 1675.

king and the catholic party—deemed it necessary to prepare a general defence of his policy, and, if not himself its author, must certainly have inspired the famous pamphlet entitled 'A Letter from a Person of Quality to his Friend in the Country,' which was published in the autumn of 1675, and immediately after the next meeting of parliament was burnt by the common hangman under orders from the House of Lords. The authorship of this pamphlet was, in his own day and subsequently, assigned to Locke;¹ but the statement was denied by him in terms too precise and emphatic to be disputed.²

After parting from his friends at St. Giles's early in November, Locke hurried up to London, there to complete the arrangements for his journey. He had not time to visit Oxford and obtain formal leave from the dean and chapter of Christ Church, on the score of ill health, for so long an absence from his student's place as he contemplated. "I am sorry for the occasion of your voyage," wrote Dr. Fell to him, "but wish you success in it, and by no means expect you should add to it by a journey hither on the score of ceremony. It is that which I by no means expect from my friends, and I hope the rest of the chapter are of the same mind. When we have occasion to meet next, I shall propose your concern to the company, and, with my affectionate remembrances, remain your assured friend and servant."³ We shall see hereafter how far Dr. Fell proved himself Locke's "assured friend and servant."

¹ Des Maizeaux, who included it in 'A Collection of Several Pieces of Mr. John Locke,' says that Shaftesbury "desired Mr. Locke to draw up this relation, which he did under his lordship's inspection, and only committed to writing what my Lord Shaftesbury in a manner dictated to him."

² Christie, vol. i., p. 261; Locke to the Earl of Pembroke, 3 Dec., 1684.

³ Lord King, p. 153; Dr. Fell to Locke, 8 Nov., 1675.

CHAPTER VII.

TRAVEL AND SOJOURN IN FRANCE.

[1675—1679.]

IT is probable that Locke's journey to France, thought of often and for a long time past, was specially undertaken in November, 1675, because Ralph Montague, the English ambassador at Paris, who had paid a short visit to England, was now returning to his post. Montague was Lady Dorothy Ashley's cousin, and Locke's acquaintance with him had apparently been of some years' standing. He afterwards showed himself to be one of the most depraved of all the depraved politicians and diplomatists of Charles the Second's reign; but this was not yet suspected, and, in any case, it was natural that Locke should avail himself of the ambassador's protection at a time when there were far fewer opportunities of crossing the channel than we now have, and when there was safety in company. Even as it was, and with a strong escort, it would seem that the party, in the day's ride from Calais to Boulogne, barely avoided an attack from some of the robbers who frequented that road.¹

Locke's journals, or the chief portions of them, for a period of several years following his arrival at Calais, have fortunately been preserved, and they enable us to follow his movements closely. They not only give us very welcome information as to his adventures and experiences,

¹ Lord King, p. 41.

the sort of topics that interested him, and his opinions thereupon, but also throw considerable light on the condition of France and the habits of the people at the time of his visit. They show us that, while going leisurely from place to place, and honestly pursuing the business for which he went abroad, the recovery, or attempted recovery, of his health, he also used every opportunity for getting profit as well as pleasure, mental as well as bodily strength, out of his long holiday.¹

Leaving London about the 15th of November, with George Walls, a young Christ Church student and clergyman, for at any rate one of his companions,² he reached Calais on the 19th of the month, and Boulogne on the 20th.³ A day's ride took him on to Montreuil, and next day he and his friends proceeded to Abbeville. There he parted from the ambassador, who had business to do in Amiens. "We," he says, "who went to seek adventure beyond Paris, plodded on nine leagues to Poix;" that being the most direct road.

At Poix they had a taste of the inconveniences of travel. "We were no sooner got into our chambers but we thought we were come there too soon, as the high-

¹ The journal for one year, 1679, is in the British Museum. The rest is among the Locke Papers in the possession of the Earl of Lovelace, from which copious extracts were made by Lord King.

² "George Walls goeth to London on Monday, in order to a journey into France," wrote Prideaux from Oxford on the 8th of November. "What is his business there I know not, unless it be to be John Locke's chaplain, whom he accompanieth thither."—'Letters of Humphrey Prideaux to John Ellis,' p. 49.

³ While in France Locke used the new style of the calendar, then in vogue on the Continent, and differing by ten days from the old English reckoning. To avoid confusion, I have altered the dates given in his journal and letters so as to make them agree with the English style.

way seemed the cleaner and more desirable place. It being decreed we must stay there all night, I called, entreated, and swaggered a good while for a pair of slippers. At last they brought them, and I sat me down on the only seat we had in our apartment, which at present was a form, but had formerly been a wooden horse. I thought to ease myself by standing; but with no very good success, I assure you; for the soles of my pantofles, being of sturdy timber, had very little compliance for my feet, and so made it somewhat uncomfortable to keep myself, as the French call it, on one end. This small taste of sabots gave me a surfeit of them, and I should not make choice of a country to pass my pilgrimage in where they are in fashion. When supper came, we sought to divert our pain, but we quickly found a supper of ill meat and worse cooking: soup and ragout and such other words of good savour lost here their relish quite, and out of five or six dishes we patched up a very uncomfortable supper. But, be it as rascally as it was, it must not fail to be fashionable. We had the ceremony of first and second course, and a dessert at the close. Whatever the fare, the treat must be in all its formality, with some haws, if no better, under the fine name of *pommes de Paradise*. After supper, we retreated to the place that usually gives relief to all moderate calamities, but our beds were antidotes to sleep. I do not complain of the hardness, but the tangible quality of what was next me, and the savour of all about me made me quite forget both slippers and supper. As we had a long journey of twelve leagues to go next day, our stay was fortunately short here. We were roused before day, and all were glad to be released from the prison. We willingly left it to the miserable souls who were to succeed us. If Paris be heaven (for

the French, with their usual justice, extol it above all things on earth), Poix certainly is purgatory.”¹

Next evening, at Tilliard, they were more fortunate. “Good mutton and a good supper, clean linen of the country and a pretty girl to lay it, who was an angel compared with the fiends at Poix, made us some amends for the past night’s suffering. Do not wonder that a man of my constitution and gravity mentions to you a handsome face amongst his remarks; for I imagine that a traveller, though he carry a cough with him, goes not out of his way when he takes notice of strange and extraordinary things.”²

As Locke was anxious that his friends should not think him more of a recluse and bookworm than he really was, it behoves modern students of his character to take note of such illustrations of its minor aspects as the foregoing and others that will be given presently.

Paris appears to have been reached on the 24th of November, and there Locke halted ten days; but of his occupations we know nothing till he arrived at Lyons on the 11th of December. He spent six days at Lyons, seeing all that was to be seen in it; among the rest a church, “now dedicated to the Virgin, which was formerly the temple of Venus;” the cathedral, “a very plain, ordinary building, nothing very observable but the clock,” in which, besides more important peculiarities, “at every hour the image of an old man, designed for the Father, shook his hand;” a museum of “pumps, clocks, and curiosities;” and the Jesuits’ college, “a large quadrangle, surrounded by high buildings, having the walls covered with pretty well-painted figures.” “The library,” Locke said concerning the latter place, “is the best that ever

¹ Lord King, pp. 41, 42.

² *Ibid.*, p. 43.

I saw, except Oxford, being one very high oblong square, with a gallery round, to come at the books." He was especially interested in the Maison de la Charité and the Hôtel Dieu. The Hôtel Dieu, he said, was "a fair large hospital, containing, as they told me, five hundred sick persons. They lie in a room which is a large cross, and three rows of beds in each; two of the arms of the cross have men, and two women; in the centre is an altar." "In the Charité, consisting of nine square courts, there are fifteen hundred, as I am told, maintained and lodged. They receive bastards, and, as soon as they are able, employ them in winding silk, the manner whereof, it being holiday, we could not see. The most considerable thing we saw was their granary, one hundred steps long, and thirty-six broad, windows open all round; there are constantly in it six thousand *ânées* of wheat (one *ânée* is an ass-load of six bushels). They turn the corn every day, about which seven men are employed. When the boys are grown up, they bind them out to traders. It is a noble foundation, and has a large revenue." "On a long neck of land between the two rivers"—the Rhone and Saone, wrote Locke, "the greatest part of Lyons is built, in narrow, irregular streets; stone houses, flat-roofed, covered with pantiles, and some turrets, and the angle of the roofs with tin. A good part of the town lies also on the right hand of the Saone; and the sides of the hills are covered with houses, gardens, and vineyards, so that it is a pleasant place. The town house is a stately building."¹

Leaving Lyons on the 17th of December, Locke proceeded, along the left bank of the Rhone, to Avignon. "In great part of the journey from Lyons," he wrote,

¹ Lord King, pp. 44, 45.

“the soil was covered with great round pebbles, in some places so thick that no earth was seen, and yet all along the corn was sown. In many places the mulberry trees and almonds, set in quincunx, covered the corn as thick as apple trees in an orchard in England. We saw several digging the ground, and some ploughing with a very little light plough with one handle, drawn by a pair of cows, steers, or asses. The soil very light and sandy; they turn it up not above two or three inches deep. In this valley we crossed many rivers and rivulets, one by ferry, some by bridges and fords, and the channels of some quite dry; but all appeared to be sometimes great and swift torrents, when either rain or melted snow is poured down into them from the high hills of Dauphiné.”¹

Crossing and recrossing the Rhone by the Pont St. Esprit, an engineering wonder of those days, Locke counted his paces, and found that he took twelve hundred and twenty steps in traversing the bridge. Shortly before doing that, he passed, near St. Vallier, a very old house, “where they say Pilate lived in banishment,” and at Orange, a little lower down, he saw “Marius’s triumphal arch, a piece of very handsome building, with trophies and Marius’s old sibyl on it.” “There remains also a very stately piece of Roman building, very high, and one hundred and seventy-six of my steps in front, on seventeen arches. There is also, in the floor of a little house, mosaic work very perfect; there was but one figure, which was of a cat. Here,” that is at Orange, “I also saw the way of winding silk by an engine that turns at once one hundred and thirty-four bobbins. It is too intricate to be described on so short a view, but all these were turned by one woman, and they both twisted

¹ Lord King, p. 46.

and wound off the silk at once. The proportion of population of the town is twelve protestants to nine papists. One protestant church we were in is a pretty sort of building, one stone arch, like a bridge, running the whole length of the church, and supporting the rafters, like the main beam of the building; a new, but not incommodious way for such a room.”¹

Roman antiquities and modern religious statistics; classical mosaic work and seventeenth century silk-spinning; Marius’s triumphal arch and the newest style of protestant church buildings: Locke certainly was a diligent observer of everything that came in his way.

At Avignon he passed a day, and inspected the pope’s palace and other mediæval remains. Thence he crossed the Rhone, and, halting at Nîmes, examined the antiquities for which it is surpassed in fame by Rome alone. The philosopher’s sword, as well as his foot, served as an improvised measure of the dimensions of the most important building. “Here we saw the amphitheatre, an admirable structure of very large stones, built apparently without mortar. At the entrance, which is under an arch, the wall is seventeen paces thick. Ascending the stairs, we come to a walk, in which there are, towards the outside, sixty arches in the whole circumference, the space of each arch being eleven of my paces; six hundred and sixty of my steps in a circle two or three yards inside the utmost bounds of it. In all those arches, to support the walls over the passage where you go round, there is a stone laid, about twenty inches or two feet square, and about six times the length of my sword, which was near about a philosophical yard long; upon which were turned other arches, contrary to those by which

¹ Lord King, pp. 46, 47.

the light entered. Most of these stones I observed to be cracked; which, I suppose, might be the effect of the fire, which Deyron tells us the Christians heretofore applied, with design to destroy this amphitheatre. It would hold twenty thousand persons, and was built by Antoninus Pius, of great squared stones, almost as hard as grey marble. Thus stands, almost entire yet, this wonderful structure, in spite of the force of fifteen hundred years and the attempts of the first Christians, who, both by fire and with tools, endeavoured to ruin it.”¹

Reaching Montpellier on Christmas-day, 1675, Locke resided there till March, 1677, except that before quite settling down he was occasionally absent for a week or two at a time, or longer, on visits to the neighbouring districts.

Thus we find him at Cette, examining a great mole or breakwater, then in construction, on the 24th of February, 1675-6, and at Aigues Mortes, on the eastern side of Montpellier, on the 14th of March. “The sea,” he said of this place, “formerly washed the walls, but is now removed a league from the town. There remains only a little *étang* navigable for very little boats. The town, said to have been built by St. Louis, is laid out very regularly; Constance tower more ancient; the country round, a great plain for many leagues about, very much covered with water. Nigh the town is the Marquis de Vard’s house, who is governor of the town and country about half a league about, as far as the tower La Carbonier. Passing between La Carbonier and the town, we saw abundance of partridges, hares, and other game, preserved there by the strict order and severity of the Marquis de Vard, who not long since clapped a townsman up in a

¹ Lord King, p. 48.

little hole in Constance tower, where he had just room to stand upright, but could not sit nor lie down, and kept him there three days, for committing some small trespass on his game.”¹

On the same or the next day he visited the salt works at Picais. “The manner is this: a great square pond, divided into squares by little banks, with channels between each to bring in the salt water, which is raised from the *étang* by wheels with wooden buckets; they cover the squares, or tables as they call them, five or six inches deep; and when the sun has exhaled almost all the moisture, they supply it with more salt water, and so continue all the heat of the year; at the latter end they have a cake of salt four or five inches thick, according to the heat and drought of the year. They that are owners of the soil are at the charge of making the salt, and sell it to the farmers for five sous the minot. The salt which the owner sells for five sous,” about twopence-halfpenny, “the farmer sells again for sixteen livres,” about thirteen shillings. “For this favour they say the farmers give two millions a year to the king, and are at as much more charge in officers and guards employed, keeping constantly in pay eighteen thousand men. The defrauding the duty of the commodity is of such consequence that, if a man should be taken with but a handful of salt not bought from the farmers, he would be sent to the galleys.”²

On the 28th of March, Locke started on a three weeks’ tour. On the 31st he was at Marseilles, then not so famous a port as now, less favoured than Toulon, and living chiefly on its ancient reputation, but busy and prosperous. “We went on board the *Royal*, the admiral’s galley; the slaves clad in the king’s livery, blue; in the

¹ Lord King, pp. 59-61.

² *Ibid.*, p. 61.

other galleys, red. This galley has twenty-nine oars of a side, two hundred and eighty slaves, sixty seamen, five hundred soldiers; the slaves in good plight. At the end of the quay are two docks, to build galleys. The docks are covered, to work out of the rain and sunshine. Every galley in this arsenal has its peculiar storehouse; great bakehouses, storehouses for bread, biscuit and meat; a great gallery one hundred and twenty fathoms long, to make ropes and cables; an armoury well-furnished; a large hospital for sick slaves; all very fit and magnificent. There go out this year twenty-six galleys. The quay is handsome, and full of people walking, especially in the evening, when the best company meet. Round about the town is a valley encompassed with high hills, or rather rocks, and a vast number of little country houses, which stand within a bow-shot one of another, some say near twenty thousand in number. They have little plots of ground walled in about them, filled with vines and fruit trees, olive trees, artichokes and corn in most of them.”¹

From Marseilles he went to Toulon, through gardens full of orange trees in full bloom and myrtles, which charmed him more than the basin, the finest in the world, in which there rode the *Royal Louis* and the *Dauphin* and other great ships of the French navy. Orange groves again delighted him as he passed on the same day, the 3rd of April, from Toulon to Hyères. “These gardens form the most delightful wood I had ever seen. There are little rivulets of water conveyed through it to water the trees in summer, without which there would be little fruit. Here we had for supper, amongst other things, a dish of green beans, dressed with gravy, the best thing

¹ Lord King, p. 63.

I ever ate. Above the town is a nunnery, of the order of St. Bernard, of persons of quality. They all eat alone in their chambers apart, keep a maid-servant and a lackey, and go out of the nunnery and walk about where they please. The situation is very pleasant, overlooking the town, the valley, the orange gardens and the sea.”¹

On the way back he took the opportunity of revisiting Avignon. “Crossed the Rhone to the Carthusian convent, where are sixty friars; their chapel well adorned with plate, crosses, and relics, very rich; amongst the rest a chalice of gold given by René, the last king of Naples of the Anjou race. I was going to take it in my hand, but the Carthusian withdrew it till he had put a cloth about the handle, and so gave it into my hand, nobody being suffered to touch these holy things but a priest. In this chapel Pope Innocent the Sixth lies interred; he died in 1362. In a little chapel in their convent stands a plain old chair, wherein he was infallible. I sat too little a while in it to get that privilege.”²

Returning to Montpellier on the 21st of April, 1676, Locke appears to have stayed there almost constantly till the following March. During those eleven months, as well as in the previous weeks, he made careful study of everything connected with the quaint old town, now far surpassed as a trading centre by Marseilles and other marts, and as a health resort by Nice and Cannes, but then a busy haunt of silk manufacturers and wine dealers, and especially famous for its medical schools—the rivals of those of Paris—and on their account, as well as on account of its superior climate and surroundings, much frequented by both invalids and students.

There can be no doubt that Locke went to Montpellier

¹ Lord King, pp. 64, 65.

² *Ibid.*, p. 65.

in both those capacities, but of his medical studies while there we have not much account. His journal naturally tells most of the general topics which were more likely to interest the friends for whom it was written.

Montpellier, with a population of thirty thousand—which population has only been increased by two-thirds in the last two centuries, while Marseilles has trebled its number of inhabitants in the past half-century—was the capital of the ancient province of Languedoc, and Locke arrived in it at a time very favourable for examining its political institutions.

“About nine in the morning,” he wrote on the 8th of January, 1675-6, “I went to the town house, where the states of Languedoc—which were then assembled in the town—used to sit every day. The room is a fair room: at the upper end, in the middle, is a seat, higher somewhat than the rest, where the Duc de Verneuil, governor of the province, sits when he comes to the assembly, which is but seldom and only upon occasions of proposing something to them. At other times Cardinal Bonzi, who is archbishop of Narbonne, takes that seat which is under the canopy: on the right hand sit the bishops, twenty-two, and the barons, twenty-five; the deputies of the town, about forty-four. About ten they begin to drop into the room where the bishops put on their habits richly laced; the cardinal in scarlet. When he arrives, away they go to mass at Nôtre Dame, a church just by; and so about eleven they return and begin to sit, and arise again at twelve, seldom sitting in the afternoon but upon extraordinary occasions. They are constantly assembled four months in the year, beginning in October and ending in February.”¹

¹ Lord King, p. 50.

“They have all the solemnity and outward appearance of a parliament,” he wrote on the 29th of January. “The king proposes, and they debate and resolve. Here is all the difference, that they never do, and some say dare not, refuse whatever the king demands. They gave the king this year 2,100,000 livres, and for their liberality are promised no soldiers shall quarter in this country; which, nevertheless, sometimes happens. Besides the 2,100,000 given the king for this year, they gave him also for the canal 300,000 livres; and besides all this, they maintain eleven thousand men in Catalonia, raised and paid by this province. These taxes and all public charges come sometimes to eight, sometimes to twelve per cent. of the yearly value of estates.”¹

Locke does not seem to have been admitted to any of the meetings of this mock parliament—less of a mockery, however, than the states general became during the century intervening between this time and the French Revolution—but he saw its members at their official devotions in Nôtre Dame. “While the priest is at the altar saying the mass, you cannot hear him a word; indeed the music is the pleasanter of the two. The cardinal and the bishops are all on the right hand of the choir, that is, standing at the altar and looking to the west end of the church; and all the lay barons to the left or south side. The cardinal sat nearest the altar, and had a velvet cushion richly laced; the bishops had none. The cardinal repeated part of the office with an unconcerned look, talking every now and then, and laughing with the bishops next him.”²

“The province of Languedoc is thus governed,” Locke wrote on the 14th of February: “The Duke of Verneuil,

¹ Lord King, p. 53.

² *Ibid.*, p. 52.

the governor, commands over the whole province, and has a power somewhat like the kings, though he be more properly lord-lieutenant. I do not hear that he meddles at all in judicial cases, either civil or criminal. In his absence the province is divided into three districts, each having a deputy-governor with the same power. Every city also has its governor, whose power is much like the governor of a garrison. Montpellier has six consuls, who have the government of the police of the town, look after weights and measures, and determine causes under five livres. They had formerly a considerable authority, but now they are little more than servants of the governor of the town. They were formerly three protestant and three papist, but the protestants were excluded the last year. The civil causes are decided by the court of aides; the premier president, and eight presidents, and thirty councillors; the cause determined by a plurality of votes.”¹

Locke gave a minute account of the criminal courts of the city and province, and in describing the distribution of taxes he showed how the chief burthen fell on the middle and lower classes, to the great injury of the whole community. “From these taxes are exempted all noble land, which is to pay a year’s value to the king every twenty years; but, as they order matters, they pay not above three-quarters of a year’s value. All ancient privileged land of the church is also exempt.” “The rent of lands in France is fallen one half in these few years, by reason of the poverty of the people. Merchants and handicraftsmen pay near half their gains.”²

Many of Locke’s notes were descriptive of the habits and customs of the dwellers in and near Montpellier. “I walked to a fine garden, a little mile from the town,” he

¹ Lord King, pp. 56, 57.

² *Ibid.*, pp. 57, 66.

wrote on the 30th of December, 1675. "The walks were bay trees and some others, cypress trees of great height, and some pine trees. At the entrance there is a fair large pond, where it is said the ladies bathe in summer. Furniture of the kitchens, some pewter, some brass, and abundance of pipkins. All the world at mall and the mountebank's tricks." On the 4th of January he referred to "the women carrying earth in little baskets on their heads, running in their sabots as they returned for new burthens: wages for men twelve sous, for women five sous, at this time; in summer, about harvest, eighteen for men, and seven for women." A month later he described a novelty, "parasols, a pretty sort of cover for women riding in the sun, made of straw, something like the fashion of tin covers for dishes."¹

On Shrove-Tuesday he saw "the height and consummation of the carnival; the town filled with masquerades for the last week; dancing in the streets in all manner of habits and disguises, to all sorts of music, brass kettles and frying-pans not excepted." "Here was in the street a great bustle," he had written a fortnight before; "the cause this. Some that were listing soldiers slid money into a countryman's pocket, and then would force him to go with them, having, as they said, received the king's money. He refused to go, and the women, by crowding and force, redeemed him. These artifices are employed where pressing is not allowed. It is a usual trick, if any one drink the king's health, to give him press-money, and force him to go a soldier, pretending that, having drunk his health, he is bound to fight for him."²

Locke was not favourably impressed by the general behaviour of the townspeople, or the arrangements for

¹ Lord King, pp. 49, 50, 55.

² *Ibid.*, pp. 56, 51.

controlling their evil dispositions. "All the highways are filled with gamesters at mall," he wrote a few days after his arrival, "so that walkers are in some danger of knocks." On the 29th of January, "Mr. Herbert's man enticed into a shop, and there fallen upon by three or four. A man shot dead by another in the street." On the 8th of March, "M. Renaie, a gentleman of the town, sacrificed a child to the devil, a child of a servant of his own, upon a design to get the devil to be his friend, and help him to get some money. Several murders committed here since I came, and more attempted; one by a brother on his sister, in the house where I lay." And on the 21st, "Many murders committed here. He that endeavoured to kill his sister in our house had before killed a man, and it had cost his father 500 écus"—about £60—"to get him off; by their secret distribution gaining the favour of the councillors."¹

Fuller information than Locke gives us about the educational institutions of Montpellier, especially its medical schools, would be welcome. His account of "the manner of making a doctor of physic" does not imply that the doctor, when made, was good for much. "The procession was in scarlet robes and black caps. The professor took his seat, and, after a company of fiddlers had played a certain time, he made them a sign to hold, that he might have an opportunity to entertain the company, which he did with a speech against innovation. The musicians then took their turn. The inceptor then began his speech, wherein I found little edification, being designed to compliment the chancellors and professors who were present. The doctor then put on his head the cap, that had marched in on the beadle's staff, in sign

¹ Lord King, pp. 49, 53, 60, 62.

of his doctorship, put a ring on his finger, girt him about the loins with a gold chain, made him sit down by him, that, having taken pains, he might now take ease, and kissed and embraced him, in token of the friendship that ought to be amongst them.”¹

In his journal, Locke made numerous entries about the trade of the district, and especially about vineyards and kindred subjects. The inquiries out of which these notes resulted were made partly for his own instruction, but chiefly, it would seem, at the request of Lord Shaftesbury, whose great pastime was gardening, and who eagerly collected all the information that was possible to him on every matter connected therewith. To Shaftesbury and others he sent home, from time to time, choice plants and specimens, and at Shaftesbury's instigation he wrote a complete little treatise, entitled ‘Observations upon the Growth and Culture of Vines and Olives, the Production of Silk, and the Preservation of Fruits.’²

This treatise furnishes interesting illustrations of the thoroughness with which Locke applied himself to every study that he took in hand. It also furnishes some welcome evidence of the social arrangements of the time. “Here at Montpellier,” we read in the section on vines, “as in other parts of France, it is no discredit for any man to hang out a bush at his door, and sell his wine by retail, either to those that fetch it out of doors or will come and drink it at his house; for which they usually, for that time, set apart a room or quarter of the house, and have a servant on purpose to attend it. This I have known both gentlemen and churchmen do. But whoever

¹ Lord King, p. 60.

² It was first published in 1766, and is included in the later editions of Locke's ‘Works.’

in Languedoc sells his own wine at his house must not afford his customers so much as a bit of bread or anything else to eat with it, for then it will come under the notion of a cabaret or common drinking house, and their tax or excise overtake them."

While in France, Locke evidently kept up a considerable correspondence with his friends in England, but only a few of the letters written to or by him appear to have been preserved. Some, from Thomas Stringer, Shaftesbury's secretary, illustrate Shaftesbury's biography more fully than Locke's,¹ but stray sentences in them should interest us.

"My lord, who, I thank God, is very well," wrote Stringer in February, 1675-6, "was very well pleased with the news of those vines and seeds you have promised him, and hath packed up your letter for the improvement of his understanding in these matters. Both him and my lady are very much concerned for you, and hope in a little time to see you here again perfectly recovered. Dr. Sydenham presents his service to you, and is now printing his book."² The book was the '*Observationes Medicæ*' that has been already referred to.

A later letter of Stringer's shows among other things that Locke had not gained all the benefit he hoped for from his first winter residence in the south of France. "I am very sorry to hear that your cough doth increase upon you. Sir Paul Neil is still of opinion that to come to England and marry a young woman is the best remedy. My lady hath received your box of orange trees, and

¹ Numerous interesting quotations from them were made by Mr. Christie, who examined the originals among the Locke Papers, when writing his '*Life of the First Earl of Shaftesbury*.'

² Christie, vol. ii., p. 220; Stringer to Locke, 17 Feb., 1675-6.

values them as a very choice present from one of her best friends. She hath sent to Serjeant Stephens, who is a man of great delight in gardens, and he hath undertaken to manage them for her. My lord is also pleased exceedingly with his present of vine cuttings, and hath taken the best care he can to preserve them. They do both, amongst other of your friends, heartily desire your recovery, and long to see you again in England.”¹

“Here are divers shells and strange things sent you from the Bahamas,” Stringer wrote two months later, “which my lord hath communicated to Mr. Boyle. They are now before the Royal Society. I doubt not but in some short time you will have a learned lecture.”²

To what extent Locke made use of the medical teaching offered to him at Montpellier does not appear. The entries in his journal show that, as soon as the first few months had been spent in exploring the neighbourhood and studying all the novelties of life in southern France, he resumed his old habit of reading, the books examined by him being especially such old and new works by French and other foreign authors as he is not likely to have had access to while he was in England.

His chief occupation during these months, perhaps carried on at intervals all through his sojourn in France, was the revision and expansion of notes written by him in the previous years, in preparation for the ‘Essay concerning Human Understanding.’ Notable indications of the way in which he was concentrating his thoughts on philosophical subjects appear in the journal. Thus on the page devoted to the 17th of March, 1675-6, we find this first entry, “Rain.” On the day before he had made an

¹ Christie, vol. ii., p. 221 ; Stringer to Locke, 6 April, 1676.

² *Ibid.*, vol. ii., p. 224 ; Stringer to Locke, 5 June, 1676.

expedition seven or eight miles out of Montpellier to visit a wonderful house, with its gardens and aqueduct, lately set up by a neighbouring marquis. On the following day he was collecting statistics about the protestants of the town. On this day perhaps the rain spoilt some plan that he had made for another expedition or another inquiry. At any rate, the rain kept him at home, and some book that he took up, or some conversation in which he engaged, set him thinking; and when his thoughts had shaped themselves, he wrote down this epitome of them:—"Imaginary space seems to me to be no more anything than an imaginary world. For, if a man and his soul remained, and the whole world were annihilated, there is left him the power of imagining either the world or the extension it had, which is all one with the space it filled; but it proves not that the imaginary space is anything real or positive. For space or extension, separated in our thoughts from matter or body, seems to have no more real existence than number has, *sine* renumeration, without anything to be numbered; and one may as well say the number of the sea-sand does really exist, and is something, the world being annihilated, as that the space or extension of the sea does exist, or is anything, after such annihilation. These are only affections of real existences—the one, of any being whatsoever; the other, only of material beings, which the mind has power, not only to conceive abstractedly, but increase by repetition or adding one to another, and to enlarge which it hath not any other ideas but those of quantity, which amount at last but to the faculty of imagining and repeating, adding units or numbering. But, if the world were annihilated, one had no more reason to think space anything than the darkness that will certainly be in it."¹

¹ Lord King, p. 62.

“Space in itself,” Locke wrote about a year later, in 1677, “seems to be nothing but a capacity, or possibility, for extended beings or bodies to be or exist, which we are apt to conceive infinite; for, there being in nothing no resistance, we have a conception, very natural and very true, that, let bodies be already as far extended as you will, yet, if other new bodies should be created, they might exist where there are now no bodies. A globe of a foot diameter might exist beyond the utmost superficies of all bodies now existing; and, because we have, by our acquaintance with bodies, got the idea of the figure and distance of the superficial part of a globe of a foot diameter, we are apt to imagine the space where the globe exists to be really something, to have a real existence before and after its existence there, whereas in truth it is really nothing, and so has no opposition or resistance to the being of such a body there: though we, applying the idea of a natural globe, are apt to conceive it as something so far extended—and these are properly the imaginary spaces that are so much disputed of.”¹

“If it be possible,” Locke added in the same paper, after some remarks on distance, “to suppose nothing, or, in our thoughts, to remove all manner of beings from any place, then this imaginary space is just nothing, and signifies no more but a bare possibility that body may exist where now there is none. If it be impossible to suppose pure nothing, or to extend our thoughts where there is, or we can suppose, no being, this space void of body must be something belonging to the being of the Deity. But, be it one or the other, the idea we have of it we take from the extension of bodies which fall under our senses; and, this idea of extension being settled in our minds, we

¹ Lord King, pp. 329, 330.

are able, by repeating that in our thoughts, without annexing body or impenetrability to it, to imagine spaces where there are no bodies; which imaginary spaces, if we suppose all other beings absent, are purely nothing, but merely a possibility that body might there exist. Or, if it be a necessity to suppose a being there, it must be God, whose being we thus make, that is, suppose extended, but not impenetrable. But, be it one or the other, extension seems to be mentally separable from body, and distance nothing but the relation of space, resulting from the existence of two positive beings, or, which is all one, two parts of the same being.”¹

Those extracts may suffice to show how Locke was investigating anew the problems of metaphysics with a view to most clearly setting forth his ripest opinions on the most important of them in his ‘*Essay concerning Human Understanding*.’ Other notes that he made at this time on kindred subjects, such as extension, species, memory, and imagination, may therefore be passed by; but one paragraph, which contains nearly the whole kernel of the ‘*Essay*,’ as far as metaphysics are involved in it, ought here to be noted.

“In questions where there are arguments on both sides,” Locke wrote in 1677, “one positive proof is to preponderate to a great many negatives, because a positive proof is always founded upon some real existence which we know and apprehend, whereas the negative arguments terminate generally in nothing, in our not being able to conceive, and so may be nothing but conclusions from our ignorance or incapacity, and not from the truth of

¹ Lord King, p. 331. Compare with these passages Locke’s expression of his views on this subject in the ‘*Essay concerning Human Understanding*,’ book ii. ch. xiii.

things which may, and we have experience do, really exist, though they exceed our comprehension. This, amongst the things we know and lie obvious to our senses, is very evident; for, though we are very well acquainted with matter, motion and distance, yet there are many things in them which we by no means comprehend. Even in the things most obvious and familiar to us, our understanding is nonplussed and presently discovers its weakness; whenever it enters upon the consideration of anything that is unlimited, or would penetrate into the modes or manner of being or operation, it presently meets with unconquerable difficulties. Matter and figure and motion, and the degrees of both, we have clear notions of; but, when we begin to think of the extension or divisibility of the one or the beginning of either, our understanding sticks and boggles and knows not which way to turn. We also have no other notion of operation but of matter by motion—at least I must confess I have not, and should be glad to have any one explain to me intelligibly any other—and yet we shall find it hard to make out any phenomenon by those causes. We know very well that we think, and at pleasure move ourselves, and yet, if we will think a negative argument sufficient to build on, we shall have reason to doubt whether we can do one or other; it being to me inconceivable how matter should think, and as incomprehensible how an immaterial thinking thing should be able to move material or be affected by it. We having, therefore, positive experience of our thinking and motion, the negative arguments against them and the impossibility of understanding them never shake our assent to these truths; which, perhaps, will prove a considerable rule to determine us in very material questions.”¹

¹ Lord King, p. 322.

It was not, however, with metaphysical problems alone that Locke was now concerning himself. Metaphysics were only recognised by him to be of any value in so far as they yield satisfactory hypotheses whereby we can extend our range of matter-of-fact knowledge. This is indicated by numerous entries in his journal, notably by one series of entries, made between March and May, 1677, while on his way back from Montpellier to Paris, which, read together, form a tolerably consecutive essay on study.

“The extent of knowledge, or things knowable,” he then wrote, “is so vast, our duration here so short, and the entrance by which the knowledge of things gets into our understanding so narrow, that the whole time of our life is not enough to acquaint us with all those things, I will not say which we are capable of knowing, but which it would be not only convenient but very advantageous to know. It therefore much behoves us to improve the best we can our time and talent in this respect, and, since we have a long journey to go, and the days are but short, to take the straightest and most direct road we can.”¹

Locke accordingly urged that the tortuous and interminable bye-paths, or jungles without even any pathways through them, in which so many men are fond of losing themselves, should be carefully avoided. Of these he enumerated five. “First: All that maze of words and phrases which have been invented and employed only to instruct and amuse people in the art of disputing; and with this kind of stuff the logics, physics, ethics, metaphysics, and divinity of the schools are thought by some to be too much filled. Empty sounds will no more improve our understandings and strengthen our reason than the noise

¹ Lord King, pp. 90, 91.

of a jack will fill our bellies or strengthen our bodies, and the art to fence with those which are called subtleties is of no more use than it would be to be dexterous in tying and untying knots in cobwebs." "Second: An aim and desire to know what have been other men's opinions. If a traveller gets a knowledge of the right way, it is no matter whether he knows the infinite windings, bye-ways, and turnings where others have been misled: the knowledge of the right secures him from the wrong, and that is his great business. I do not say this to undervalue the light we receive from others, or to think there are not those who assist us mightily in our endeavours after knowledge; but I think it is an idle and useless thing to make it one's business to study what have been other men's sentiments in things where reason is only to be judge, on purpose to be furnished with them, and to be able to cite them on all occasions." "Third: Purity of language, a polished style, and exact criticism in foreign languages. To spend much time in these may perhaps serve to set one off in the world and give one the reputation of a scholar; but, if that be all, methinks it is labouring for an outside. It is at best but a handsome dress of truth or falsehood that one busies one's self about, and makes most of those who lay out their time this way rather fashionable gentlemen than wise or useful men." "Fourth: Antiquity and history, as far as they are designed only to furnish us with story and talk. I do not deny but history is very useful and very instructive of human life; but, if it be studied only for the reputation of being an historian, it is a very empty thing, and he that can tell all the particulars of Herodotus and Plutarch, Curtius and Livy, without making any other use of them, may be an ignorant man with a good memory." "Fifth:

Nice questions and remote useless speculations; as, where the earthly paradise was, or what fruit it was that was forbidden, where Lazarus's soul was whilst his body lay dead, and what kind of bodies we shall have at the resurrection."¹

The only proper objects of study, Locke urged, are, in the first place, the way of obtaining happiness in the other world; and, in the second, "a quiet prosperous passage through this, which requires a discreet conduct and management of ourselves in the usual occurrences of our lives;" and our studies should be chosen in accordance with these objects, each individual selecting those pursuits for which he finds himself best fitted. And he should be prudent, not only in limiting the range of his studies, but also in limiting his devotion to them. "I am sure the principal end why we are to get knowledge here is to make use of it for the benefit of ourselves and others in this world, but, if by gaining it we destroy our health, we labour for a thing that will be useless in our hands. He that sinks his vessel by overloading it, though it be with gold and silver and precious stones, will give his owner but an ill account of his voyage." Locke, bringing his medical knowledge to bear, pointed out very cogently the importance of complying with the requirements of nature as regards sleep, diet, and the like, showing that studious men ought to do this more carefully than other men as their sedentary habits render them more liable to disease.²

He next enlarged on a subject about which he was always eloquent. "The subject being chosen, the body and mind being both in a temper fit for study, what remains but that a man betake himself to it? These

¹ Lord King, pp. 91-94.

² *Ibid.*, pp. 95-99.

certainly are good preparatories; yet, if there be not something else done, perhaps we shall not make all the profit we might. It is a duty we owe to God, as the fountain and author of all truth, who is truth itself—and it is a duty also we owe to our own selves, if we will deal candidly and sincerely with our own souls—to have our minds constantly disposed to entertain and receive truth wheresoever we meet with it, and under whatsoever appearance of plain or ordinary, strange, new or perhaps displeasing, it may come in our way. Truth is the proper object, the proper riches and furniture of the mind, and according as his stock of this is, so is the difference and value of one man above another. He that fills his head with vain notions and false opinions may have his mind perhaps puffed up and seemingly much enlarged; but in truth it is narrow and empty; for all that it comprehends, all that it contains, amounts to nothing, or less than nothing; for falsehood is below ignorance, and a lie worse than nothing. Our first and great duty then is to bring to our studies and to our inquiries after knowledge a mind covetous of truth, that seeks after nothing else, and after that impartially, and embraces it, how poor, how contemptible, how unfashionable soever it may seem.”¹

To set forth what seemed to him the best ways of performing that duty was the chief object of Locke’s discourse. But of his views thereon we shall meet with fuller expression hereafter. From this somewhat rambling but excellent essay, or fragmentary sketch of an essay, only one other passage need be quoted. “It is of great use in the pursuit of knowledge,” Locke said, “not to be too confident nor too distrustful of our own judgment, not to believe we can comprehend all

¹ Lord King, pp. 99, 100.

things nor nothing. He that distrusts his own judgment in everything, and thinks his understanding not to be relied on in the search of truth, cuts off his own legs that he may be carried up and down by others, and makes himself a ridiculous dependant upon the knowledge of others, which can possibly be of no use to him; for I can no more know anything by another man's understanding than I can see by another man's eyes. So much I know, so much truth I have got, so far I am in the right, as I do really know myself. Whatever other men have, it is in their possession, it belongs not to me, nor can be communicated to me but by making me alike knowing; it is a treasure that cannot be lent or made over. On the other side, he that thinks his understanding capable of all things, mounts upon wings of his own fancy, though indeed nature never meant him any, and so, venturing upon the vast expanse of incomprehensible verities, only makes good the fable of Icarus and loses himself in the abyss. We are here in the state of mediocrity; finite creatures, furnished with powers and faculties very well fitted to some purposes, but very disproportionate to the vast and unlimited extent of things."¹

While residing at Montpellier, if not also on the road thither, Locke had the company of a new friend who must not be lost sight of—the “Mr. Herbert” who has been mentioned in our narrative. Thomas Herbert, brother and now heir of the seventh Earl of Pembroke, was born in or near the year 1656. In 1672 he joined Christ Church, Oxford, with the privileges of a nobleman's son, and, not waiting for a degree, he left it in 1674 or 1675. Locke probably knew something of him at the university, and it is pretty certain that he also

¹ Lord King, pp. 104, 105.

knew something of him or his kinsfolk while residing with Lord Shaftesbury. It is possible that Herbert may have travelled with Locke through France to Montpellier; but all we know is that they were much together at Montpellier in 1676, and that between the man of forty-four and the youth of twenty there grew up a hearty and life-long friendship.¹ The inordinate compliments that Locke, following the fashion of his time, paid to Herbert, then Earl of Pembroke, in dedicating to him in 1690 the 'Essay concerning Human Understanding,' must not prejudice us against one whose private worth and intellectual strength seem to have been quite on a par with the statesmanly capacities that he afterwards exhibited.

For disputing the legal existence of Parliament after it had been prorogued during fifteen months, Lord Shaftesbury was committed to the Tower of London, in the middle of February, 1676-7, and he was a prisoner for more than a year. He had been there only a few days when he wrote the only letter addressed by him to Locke, while the latter was in France, which has been preserved. "Sir John Banks, my intimate good friend," he said, "is sending his son into France to travel about that country for four or five months. He hath already learnt the French tongue, but is very willing to let him see the manners of those people. Sir John intends to send him over to Paris about a fortnight hence, in the custody of Sir Richard Dutton, who is going thither, and there is very desirous, if you will undertake that charge,

¹ MSS. in the Remonstrants' Library; Lady Masham to Le Clerc, 12 Jan., 1704-5.

to have him recommended to your care. In order thereunto he begs the kindness of you to come and meet him at Paris, where Sir Richard Dutton is to deliver him up to your care. As for the charges of your travels, Sir John is to defray them, and will otherwise, as he saith, give you such a reward as becometh a gentleman.”¹

Locke agreed to the arrangement that had been thus made for him. “I received your letter from Toulouse,” Stringer wrote, “and am glad to hear you are so far on your journey towards us. I should be mighty glad all things would so far concur that we might be so happy to see you perfectly well in England this summer. Sir John Banks is very much satisfied with your taking charge of his son. He concludes him as well as though he was under his own care, and I am very well pleased you have so fair an opportunity to close your travels this summer.”²

Whether Locke intended in any case to leave Montpellier in the spring of 1677 does not appear; but Shaftesbury's letter caused him to start for Paris at once. He did not follow the most direct road, however, preferring to travel through western France instead of returning by the eastern route, which he had taken in the autumn of 1675. He was at Toulouse towards the end of March, and thence he proceeded towards Bordeaux. But either while he was on the road to Bordeaux, or after his arrival, he fell ill, and was detained on the road for several weeks. Continuing his journey as soon as he was able, he journeyed by way of Poitiers and Tours, and reached Paris on the 23rd of May.³

¹ Christie, vol. ii., p. 235; Shaftesbury to Locke, 23 Feb., 1676-7.

² *Ibid.*, vol. ii., p. 236; Stringer to Locke, 9 April, 1677.

³ Lord King, pp. 68, 69.

His new pupil had probably been waiting for him about two months. Of his relations with this pupil—whose father, according to Evelyn, “was a merchant of small beginning, but had amassed 100,000*l.*”—we know very little. They were maintained through nearly two years, instead of the four or five months that had been at first projected; and, in consequence of this arrangement, Locke remained in France some time longer than he had intended. Writing to Boyle in July, 1678, he named Sir John Banks as the friend who transmitted his English letters to him.¹

Of Locke’s connection with Boyle we have not seen much for some years past. That it had not been broken, however, appears from a letter that he wrote to his old Oxford friend two days after his arrival in Paris. This letter tells us a little about Locke’s illness and shows us that it had robbed him neither of his playfulness nor of his interest in scientific questions and the more useful of the matters with which the Royal Society was concerned. His purpose in writing it was to offer his services in collecting curiosities and information for the prince of *virtuosi*.

“Now I have come to this place, which is one of the great magazines of things and persons of all sorts,” he said, “I thought there might be something wherein I might here be in a condition to serve you. Though I believe you are not much concerned to know whether broad or narrow-brimmed hats be like to carry it this summer, or which is the newest *à-la-mode* cut of pantaloons: yet, in this universal mint of new things, there are

¹ Boyle, ‘Works,’ vol. v., p. 569; Locke to Boyle, [27 July—] 6 Aug., 1678. In dating his letters, Locke followed the continental arrangement of the calendar, making a difference of ten days.

some others that possibly you will think worth your inquiry and knowledge. I dare undertake for myself that I shall be a very faithful and diligent factor, and you cannot blame me for desiring the employment, since I may enrich myself in it very honestly, without at all lessening any part of your returns. And to confess the truth, I have another private interest of my own in it. I would beg the favour of two or three lines from your hand to recommend me to the acquaintance of any one of the *virtuosi* you shall think fit here. I know your bare name will open doors and gain admittance for me where otherwise one like me, without port or name, that have little tongue and less knowledge, shall hardly get entrance.”¹

That was not mere compliment, except as regards the “less knowledge.” The tables are now turned; but in 1677 Boyle, not Locke, was the famous philosopher. Boyle, moreover, had lived some time in Paris, and had many friends there.

“They talk here,” Locke added, “of a little brass globe, three or four inches diameter, that, being wound up once a month, shows all the motions of the heavens. I am so newly come hither, and am, since my late ague, so ill a walker, that I have not yet seen it. But I hope in a little while my legs will come again to themselves, and be able to carry me about lustily, and then I shall be trudging up and down in quest of new discoveries.”

Soon after writing thus to Boyle, Locke despatched a letter to his more intimate friend John Mapletoft, which illustrates the character and affairs of both men.

¹ Boyle, ‘Works,’ vol. v., p. 568; Locke to Boyle, [25 May—] 4 June, 1677.

“DEAR SIR,—If you make not use of the same goodness in excusing my silence as you use to do in affording me your letters, I shall be in great danger of your hard thoughts, and you will in appearance have reason to imagine that I know not how to value either your friendship or correspondence as I ought. When I think on the particular accidents and considerations that have caused this neglect in me, methinks I have something to say for myself; but when I look on the length of time, all at once methinks nothing is enough to excuse it. However, I will not enter upon the long story of my vindication. I choose rather to throw myself wholly upon your mercy. I know your kindness will stand a greater shock than this, and you will not be much angry with me for a fault wherein I have been the sufferer as well as the guilty. If I thought it were necessary to say anything more than this, I would refer you to the enclosed. But I fancy with myself that is some kind of merit of your pardon that I dare expect it of you, without troubling you with a long story—which, for my vindication, I have thought necessary to tell one who yet I think a very good friend and very good-natured.

“I arrived here about the beginning of this month, with the remains of a very untoward ague upon me, which seized and kept me a while upon the way; but, I thank God, have now pretty well recovered my strength, so that if you have any commands for me here, I might hope to execute them. But I have little expectation of any from you. You that, when you were here yourself, and breathed the air of this place, which seems to me not very much to favour the severer sects of philosophers, were yet so great a one as to provide for all your necessities with the expense of only a crown or two, will not, I guess, now that you are out of the sight of all our gaudy fashionable temptations, have much employment for a factor here; but yet, if either absence, which sometimes increases our desires, or love, which we see every day produces strange effects in the world, have softened you or disposed you towards any liking of any of our fine new things, 'tis but saying so, and I am ready to furnish you and should be sorry not to be employed.

“I mention love, for you know I have a particular interest of my own in it. When you look that way, nobody will be readier, as you may guess, to throw an old shoe after you, much for your own sake, and a little for a friend of yours. But, were I to advise you, perhaps I should say to you that your lodgings at Gresham College were a very quiet and comfortable habitation. I know not how I am got into this chapter of love, unless the genius of the place inspires me with it, for I do not find that my ague has

much inclined me to the thoughts of it. My health, which you are so kind to in your wishes, is the only mistress I have a long time courted, and is so coy a one that I think it will take up the remainder of my days to obtain her good graces and keep her in good humour. She hath of late been very wayward, but, I hope, is coming about again. I shall be glad that my constant addresses should at last prevail with her, that I might be in a better condition to enjoy and serve you; being, with all sincerity, dear sir, your most humble servant,

“JOHN LOCKE.

“My service, I beseech you, to all my friends in your walks, particularly Dr. Sydenham. The spell held till I had left Montpellier,¹ for by all the art and industry I could use I could not get a book of his to Montpellier till the week after I had left it. I shall be glad to hear that every day gains ground, though that be not always the fate of useful truth, especially at first setting out. I shall perhaps be able to give him an account of what some ingenious men think of it here; though I imagine he is so well satisfied with the truth in it and the design that made him publish it, that he matters not much what men think. And yet that is usually a very great and allowable pleasure to see the trees take and thrive in our own time which we ourselves have planted.”²

That gossiping, playful, melancholy letter needs some annotation. When we last heard of Mapletoft, he was in France, continuing the journey with the Countess of Northumberland, in which Locke had been his companion for a few weeks in the autumn of 1672. When he returned to England is not stated, but it must have been before the 27th of March, 1675, as on that day he was elected professor of physic at Gresham College, an appointment bringing some emolument and considerable dignity, Gresham College being then in its palmyest age and a rival of Oxford and Cambridge in its teaching of the sciences. In 1676, while Locke was at Montpellier,

¹ Locke must in a previous letter have mentioned his inability to obtain a copy of the ‘*Observationes Medicae*’ that Sydenham had published in 1676.

² *European Magazine*, vol. xv. (1789), p. 10; Locke to Mapletoft, [12—] 22 June, 1677.

Ralph Montague, the English ambassador in France of whom mention has been made, married Lady Northumberland, then a widow of six years' standing, and Mapletoft appears to have spent a vacation with them in Paris. He was in London, however, in May, 1677, when Locke heard that he himself had thoughts of marrying. This news was interesting to Locke, as he hinted in his letter, not only on Mapletoft's own account, but because the marriage would compel Mapletoft to resign his Gresham professorship, in which, if thus happily vacated, he was anxious to succeed him.¹

This state of things is pleasantly described in the two letters next to be quoted. The allusion in the first to Isaac Barrow—who had been geometry professor at Gresham College, as well as Greek professor at Cambridge, and who died on the 14th of May, 1677, when he was only forty-seven years old—is interesting, as containing the only positive intimation we have of the friendship that existed between him and Locke. That Mapletoft was one of his most intimate friends is well known.

“SIR,—When I do not hear from my friends for a long time, I presently conclude that either theirs or my letter hath miscarried, and so betake myself to the known remedy of writing again.

“I have been now here about these two months, and though you, that could do all your markets here for yourself for two or three crowns, will not, 'tis likely, much need a factor, and so I can hope for no employment from you, yet you must consider that I need to hear from you, and having lost lately two very considerable friends in England, Sir John King and Dr. Barrow, you will not blame me if I inquire a little earnestly what is become of the rest. The place you have given me in your friendship, and the great concernment it is to me to preserve that advantage, allow me to

¹ Ward, 'Lives of the Gresham Professors,'—the copy in the British Museum, with Ward's manuscript notes.

be inquisitive. You must therefore excuse my importunity. I, who love my ease, even to a great degree of laziness, cannot take it amiss that you should be indulgent to yours; but, since you have charity enough sometimes to have your rest broken for the relief of others, permit me also to apply myself to you for a pain which you only can remedy; and let me know by the first that you are well and preserve me in your memory.

“I understand, both from himself and from others, that our good friend Dr. Sydenham hath of late been very ill of more than one malady. I hope he is by this time well recovered, and returned again to his old thoughts and practice of physic. I am very much concerned for it, both for the public and my own particular interest. Pray remember me very kindly to him, and in your next do me the favour to let me know how he also does.

“I am, dear sir, your most affectionate humble servant,

“JOHN LOCKE.”¹

Under the same cover was enclosed the following more important letter:—

“DEAR SIR,—I had no sooner done my letter on the other side, but I found it answered by yours of July 25. And, though it hath satisfied me that you are very well, and given me new proofs that you are very much my friend, yet it hath put new doubts into me, and methinks I see you going to lose yourself. I will say no worse of it, not knowing how far the matter is gone; else I would ask you whether she were young, old, or middle-aged, each of which is sure to meet you with the horns of a dilemma. I see you are, whatever you think, hot upon the scent, and if you have nothing else to defend you but those maxims you build on, I fear the chase will lead you where you yourself will be caught. For, be as grave and steady as you please, resolve as much as you will never to go out of your way nor pace for never an ‘hey nony nony’ whatsoever, you are not one jot the safer for all this sturdiness. For believe it, sir, this sort of game, having a design to be caught, will hunt just at the pursuer’s rate, and will go no further before than will just serve to make you follow; and let me assure you, upon as good authority as honest Tom Bagnall’s, that *Vivus vidensque pereo* is the lamentable ditty of many an honest gentleman. But if you or the fates have determined (for the poor fates are still to be accused in the case), if your mettle be up, and, as bold as Sir Francis Drake, you will shoot the desperate gulf, yet consider, though the riches of

¹ *European Magazine*, vol. xv. (1789), p. 89; Locke to Mapletoft, [30 July—] 9 August, 1677.

Peru lie that way, how well you can endure the warm navigation of the Mare de Zur, which all travellers assure us is nicknamed Pacificum. But hold: I go too far. All this, perhaps, notwithstanding your ancient good principles, will be heresy to you by that time it comes to England; and therefore I conjure you by our friendship to burn this as soon as you have read it, that it may never rise up in judgment against me. I see one is never sure of one's self, and the time may come when I may resign myself up to the empire of the soft sex, and abominate myself for these miserable errors. However, as the matter now stands, I have discharged my conscience, and pray do not let me suffer for it. For I know you lovers are a sort of people that are bound to sacrifice all to your mistresses. But, to be serious with you, if your heart does hang that way, I wish you good luck. May Hymen be as kind to you as ever he was to anybody! and then I'm sure you will be much happier than any forlorn bachelor can be.

“ If it be like to be, I beg you to continue your care of my interest in the case, and remember it is for one that knows how to value the quiet and retirement you are going to quit. You have no more to do for me than what lovers use to do upon their own account, viz., keep the matter as secret and private as you can; and then, when it is ripe and resolved, give me but notice, and I shall quickly be with you. For 'tis by your directions I shall better govern my motions than by the flight of thrushes and field-fares. Some remains of my cough, and something like a charge is fallen into my hands lately here, will, if nothing else happen, keep me out probably longer than the time you mention. But, not knowing whether the air of France will ever quite remove my old companion or no, I shall neglect that uncertainty upon the consideration of so comfortable an importance; and, for the other affair I have here, if you please to let me hear from you sometimes how matters are like to go, I shall be able to order that well enough to come at the time you shall think seasonable.

“ Whatever happens, I wish you all the happiness of one or t'other condition; for I am very perfectly, dear sir, your most humble and obedient servant,

“ JOHN LOCKE.

“ I am very glad to hear that Dr. Sydenham is getting out of his long fit. Pray remember me kindly to him. My service also to Mr. Firmin and the rest of my friends at your end of the town. I shall take care of your Tulley, and be very glad of any other commands from you.”¹

¹ *European Magazine*, vol. xv., p. 89: also *Additional MSS.* in the British Museum, no. 6194; ‘Miscellaneous Collections relating to Gresham College,’ by J[ohn] W[ard], vol. ii., p. 245.

The "something like a charge," which kept Locke in Paris without being at all imperative, was evidently the half-tutorship of Sir John Banks's son. Mapletoft did not marry before November, 1679, and therefore retained his professorship till October in the same year, so that Locke had no inducement, on that account, to hasten his return to England. He therefore remained in Paris until the beginning of July, 1678.

Concerning his occupations during this period, his journals being scanty, we have much less information than concerning those of the previous year and a half. Being very much out of health, he appears to have done little more than take holiday, but of the gay sights and strange sights that must have come before him in the French metropolis we have not much account. The more important of the incidents about which we do know anything will be best reported in chronological order.

Shortly before reaching Paris, while passing through Tours, which he described as "a long town, well peopled and thriving, which it owes to the great manufacture of silk," Locke made a few interesting notes, showing that if the town thrived it was not through good government. "Wine and wood pay tax to the king; besides he sends to the several companies of the trades for so much money as he thinks fit. The officer of each *corps de métier* taxes every one according to his worth. A bourgeois that lives in the town, if he have land in the country and let it, pays nothing; but the peasant who rents it, if he be worth anything, pays for what he has, but he makes no defalcation"—that is, reduction—"of his rent. The manner of taxing in the country is this: the tax to be paid being laid upon the parish, the collectors of the year assess every one of the inhabitants according as they

judge him worth, but consider not the land in the parish belonging to any one living out of it. This is that which so grinds the peasant in France. The collectors make their rates usually with great inequality. There lies an appeal for the over-taxed, but I find not that the remedy is made much use of.”¹

Almost immediately after his arrival in Paris, Locke visited the Bibliothèque du Roi, where, among other things, he saw “Henry the Fourth’s love letters in his own hand,” and “the first Bible ever printed, 1492, on vellum.” “But what seemed of all the most curious was eighteen large folios of plants, drawn to the life, and six of birds, so exactly well done that whoever knew any of the plants or birds before would then know them at first sight. They are done by one M. Robert, who is still employed with the same work. M. Silvestre is employed in drawing the king’s twelve houses. The library keeper told us there were fourteen thousand manuscripts.”²

“At Mr. Butterfield’s,” he wrote two months later, on the 28th of July, “I saw a levelling instrument, made to hang and turn horizontally. The sight was taken by a perspective glass of four glasses about a foot long. Between the first and second glass was placed a single filament of silk, stretched horizontally, by which the level was taken. There was a heavy weight of lead hung down perpendicular about a foot long, to keep the telescope horizontal.” “At the observatory,” he added on the 18th of August, “we saw the moon in a twenty-two foot glass, and Jupiter, with his satellites, in the same. The most remote was on the east, the other three on the west. We saw also Saturn in his ring, in a twelve foot glass, and one of his satellites.”³

¹ Lord King, p. 69.

² *Ibid.*, p. 69.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 70.

If the astronomical observations of two hundred years ago were crude, the knowledge of oriental affairs was yet more crude. Locke made the acquaintance of Bernier, the greatest eastern traveller of those days, but did not learn much from him. "M. Bernier told me that the heathens of Hindostan pretend to great antiquity; that they have books and histories in their language; that their nodus in their numbers is ten, as ours, and their circuit of days seven; that they are in number about ten to one to the Mahometans; that Aurungzebe had lately engaged himself very inconveniently in wars with them upon account of religion, endeavouring to bring them by force to Mahometanism, and, to discourage or bring over the Banians, or undo them, he had given exemption to the trading Mahometans, by which means his revenue was much lessened, the Banians making use of the name of Mahometans to trade under, and so eluding his partiality."¹

Whether Locke's offer to be "factor" to Mapletoft and Boyle was accepted, we do not know; but it is most likely that Boyle, at any rate, being an indefatigable collector of novelties, made use of him, and it is certain that he was useful to other people, especially to Shaftesbury. "His lordship desires that you will get him the best maps of Champagne, Lorraine, Luxemburg, and the country between the river Sambre and Luxemburg," Stringer wrote from London, "because the war in all probability will come there again. Likewise he desires you will inquire and let him know what books the dauphin was first initiated in to learn Latin. He apprehends there are some books, both Latin and French, either *janua-linguarum* or colloquies; and also he desires to

¹ Lord King, p. 70.

know what grammars. This he conceives may be best learnt from those two printers that printed the dauphin's books."¹

It is interesting to find Shaftesbury, unjustly imprisoned in the Tower, concerning himself thus actively about the education of his little grandson, now not much past his sixth year; and, if it seems strange that he should desire the child to learn Latin from the same books as were used for the son of Louis the Fourteenth, it must be remembered that for that son the famous Delphin classics were being just at this time prepared.

"I opened the box of things," Stringer went on to say, "and have furnished him with those books you sent over. He has engaged to be very careful in restoring them, and in order thereunto hath got a box to keep them in apart from all other things; and it proves a very good entertainment in this time of close confinement. Amongst those books his lordship finds a printed paper of all the general officers of the king of France for the year 1675. If there are any such papers printed for the years 1676 and 1677, he desires you will give yourself the trouble of sending them unto him."²

"I will take care to inquire after the maps you have sent by Sir Thomas Armstrong's daughter," Stringer wrote seven weeks later; "for they will be of great use unto my lord, his chief divertisement being in books, maps, and papers."³ Two years afterwards Locke received, with other sums, 3s. 10d., which he had paid for maps of Lorraine, Luxemburg, Champagne, Hainault, and Namur, bought on Shaftesbury's account,⁴ but there

¹ Christie, vol. ii., p. 248; Stringer to Locke, 16 August, 1677.

² *Ibid.* ³ *Ibid.*, vol. ii., p. 250; Stringer to Locke, 5 October, 1677.

⁴ *Shaftesbury Papers*, series ii., no. 312.

is nothing to show that he purchased any of the Delphin classics.

That he was taking good care of the youth now under his immediate charge may be inferred from a letter in which, writing to Sir John Banks on the 18th of August, he gave reasons against their long residence in Paris. "As to the improvements of travel," he said, "I think they are all comprehended in these four: knowledge, which is the proper ornament and perfection of the mind, exercise, which belongs to the body, language, and conversation. Of all these, exercise only is that which seems to persuade the spending his time in Paris. I grant some parts of mathematics might be learnt here, but methinks he is not yet ready for these sciences, for to engage one in mathematics who is not yet acquainted with the very rudiments of logic is a method of study I have not known practised, and seems to me not very reasonable." "They," he added, "who imagine that the improvements of foreign conversation are to be sought by making acquaintance and friendships abroad seem to me wholly to mistake the matter, and it appears to me quite another thing. The great benefit to be found by travel is by constant changing of company, and conversing every day with unknown strangers is to get a becoming confidence, and not to be abashed at new faces, to accustom one's self to treat everybody civilly and to learn by experience that that which gets one credit and recommends one to others is not the fortune one is born to, but the riches of the mind and the good qualities one possesses. And were it not for this one thing I know not why young gents should not be sent for breeding rather to the court of England than the inns and eating houses of France."¹

¹ I have not seen this letter (endorsed "J. L. to Sir J. B., 28 Aug., '77"),

It would seem that Sir John Banks agreed with Locke, but that Lady Banks wished her son to remain in the gay city and gained her point.

During the autumn Locke visited all the places of note in Paris and the neighbourhood. The Palais Mazarin he described as "a house very well furnished with pictures and statues, and cabinets in great plenty and very fine; the roofs of the rooms extremely richly painted and gilded." "At the Louvre," he said, "we saw abundance of riches, both in agate, gold and silver vessels; two frames of looking glasses newly made, each weighing in silver 2400 marks, each mark, so wrought, costing the king fifty-two livres; and beds, exceedingly rich in embroidery, one of which, begun by Francis the First, which Cardinal Richelieu had finished and presented to the king, cost 200,000 écus. At the Gobelins we saw the hangings; very rich and good figures. In every piece Louis le Grand was the hero, and the rest the marks of some conquest; in one, his making a league with the Swiss, where he lays his hand on the book to swear the articles, with his hat on, and the Swiss ambassador in a submissive posture, with his hat off." ¹

In October he went to Versailles. "The chateau there is a fine house; and a much finer garden, situated on a little rise of ground, though a place naturally without water, has more *jets d'eaux* and water-works than are elsewhere to be seen. Looking out from the king's apartments, one sees almost nothing but water for a whole league forward; basins, *jets d'eaux*, a canal, in which are a

which was sold by auction in 1859; but am indebted to the Rev. J. E. Jackson, canon of Bristol, for the extracts from it which I have given above.

¹ Lord King, pp. 70, 71.

man-of-war of thirty guns, two yachts, and several lesser vessels. The cascades, basins, etc., in the garden are so many, and so vigorously contrived, it would require much time to describe them. We had the honour to see them with the king, who walked about with Madame Montespan from one to another, after having driven her and two other ladies in the coach with him about a good part of the garden. The coach had six horses. The rooms at the chateau are but little, and the stairs seem very little in proportion to the greatness of the persons who are to mount by them. The great men's houses seem at first sight to stand irregularly scattered at a distance, like cottages in a country village, among which the chateau, being higher and bigger than the rest, looks like the manor-house; but when one takes a view of them from the centre of the chateau, they appear to be ranged in good order, and they make a pleasing prospect, considering they are in a place where nature seems to have conferred no favour. We saw the house and lodgings. The king and queen's apartments are very fine, but little rooms, near square. In the new lodgings they are somewhat bigger. There are six of them, one within another, all vaulted roofs. The king's cupboard is without the room, on the stair-head in the passage, and standing in the hollow of a window; and so is the dauphin's, on the other side of the court, on the stairs that go up there. Both the king and he eat in the rooms next the stairs and have no ante-chamber to them."¹

Locke also visited Fontainebleau while the court was there. "One passes through the great forest for three or four miles," he wrote, "before one comes to the town, situated in a little open plain, encompassed with rocky, woody

¹ Lord King, pp. 71, 72.

hills. At night we saw the opera of 'Alceste.' The king and queen sat on chairs with arms. On the right hand of the king sat Madame Montespan; and a little nearer the stage, on her right hand, mademoiselle the king of England's niece. On the left hand of the queen sat monsieur, and at his left hand, advancing towards the stage, madame, and so forward towards the stage other ladies of the court, all on tabourets except the king and queen. We saw the house at Fontainebleau, and at night a ball, where the king and queen and the great persons of the court danced, and the king himself took pains to clear the room to make place for the dancers. The queen was very rich in jewels. The king and queen, etc., were placed as at the opera. The Duc d'Enghien sat behind."¹

Of course his acquaintance with Montague, the English ambassador, and yet more, with the ambassador's new wife, the Countess of Northumberland, made it easy for Locke to study all the gaities of French court life. Montague was then in the thickest of his plots for and against his master, Charles the Second; but never for and always against the honour and well-being of the country which Charles and nearly all his advisers were doing their utmost to degrade and disgrace among the nations of Europe. Montague's plots, however, were secret, even from his wife perhaps; and continued to be for the most part a secret till more than a century after his death; and now, and for a long time afterwards, he passed for a shrewd and loyal Englishman. Of his beautiful wife, so highly esteemed by both Locke and Mapletoft, we know little; but all we know is in her praise. "She was," said Locke's later friend, Lady Masham, "a lady no less distinguished by her great virtue, parts, and every excellent of the mind,

¹ Lord King, p. 72.

than she was by her rank, riches, or beauty; a concurrence of all which gifts of fortune and nature were hardly again to be found in the like degree to that wherein she possessed them, which made her everywhere to receive extraordinary marks of honour and respect."¹ Where a lady's virtue, beauty and good breeding are concerned, another lady's admiration is more to be accepted in proof than the admiration of even such a man as Locke, and we are bound to believe that Lady Masham's encomium was deserved. It will be remembered that, writing to Mapletoft in February, 1673, Locke styled her "the best lady in France," and he still held the same opinion of her. Proof of his regard appears in three letters concerning her, which he sent to Mapletoft from Paris, in November, 1677.

"I never had a more unwelcome occasion of writing to you than now," he said, in the first, written at ten o'clock on a Saturday morning, "believing I can scarce send you more unacceptable news than that of the illness of a person whom not only you and I, but all the world, have so great reason to esteem and admire. On Thursday night last, I was sent for to my lady ambassadress, whom I found in a fit of such violent and exquisite torment that (though she be, as you know, a person of extraordinary temper—and I have seen her even in the course of this distemper endure very great pain with a patience that seemed to feel nothing) it forced her to such cries and shrieks as you would expect from one upon the rack, to which I believe hers was an equal torment." Locke then proceeded to describe very fully the symptoms of what seems to have been a very aggravated attack of

¹ MSS. in the Remonstrants' Library; Lady Masham to Le Clerc, 12 Jan., 1704-5.

neuralgia, so aggravated that he thought it must be a malady of more serious import, and to detail the treatment he had thus far adopted. Perhaps his sympathy for the patient made him attach more importance to the case than it deserved. That he thought it very important is evident. "I wish, with all my heart, you were here," he said in the last paragraph, "both to assist my lady by your better skill and to ease me of a part of that solicitude I am under, having the care of a person of her consideration wholly upon me—she having had so little success with the French physicians here this summer in the like case, wherein for eight days together their applications did her no good, that she is resolved to try them no more. I beg your opinion, and of whoever else of the ablest of our physicians you shall think fit to consult with; but I wish much more for your company than your opinion without it. I beg your pardon for my ill writing. It is in haste and in fear."¹

That letter was followed by another, written in the afternoon of the same day, describing the progress of the case in the intervening hours, and adding some general information which "haste and hurry" had caused to be omitted from the former letter;² and by yet another written on Sunday evening, reporting that Lady Northumberland was very much better. "Notwithstanding these present good circumstances," Locke said in a postscript, "yet I continue my request to you to hasten away the best advice you can send me; for one cannot be too well fortified against such an enemy who hath already made more than one assault and after a cessation returned."³

¹ *European Magazine*, vol. xv. (1789), p. 185; Locke to Mapletoft, [24 Nov.—] 4 Dec., 1677.

² *Ibid.*, p. 186; Locke to Mapletoft, [24 Nov.—] 4 Dec., 1677.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 273; Locke to Mapletoft, [25 Nov.—] 5 Dec., 1677.

Mapletoft, upon receiving these communications, consulted Sydenham, and enclosed an "opinion" from him in the letter that he sent to Paris with as little delay as possible. "I cannot but tell you," wrote Locke, in acknowledging this packet, "I was ready to cry out, 'The spirit of the prophets is upon the sons of the prophets,' I having, in what I have done here, not only proceeded by the same method, but used the very remedies he recommended as to the main." In this letter he was able to report that Lady Northumberland had recovered, and that all he was now anxious about was the best way of putting her into such good general health that she might hope to have no like attacks in future. "I have proposed also a total abstinence from wine, light suppers, and early going to bed, and great care of taking cold—which I think is not to be done by keeping herself very warm (which in my opinion is the readiest way to get colds), but by being and exercising frequently in the air."¹

Though Locke thus acted as the medical attendant of one of his friends, and was anxious to be appointed professor of physic at Gresham College, he does not appear to have paid any particular attention to medical subjects while in Paris. He occasionally, however, visited the hospitals. We have an account, for instance, of an "odd case" which he investigated at the Hôpital de la Charité, in and after May, 1678—the case of "a boy about eighteen years old, who had a kind of horns grow out in the place of his nails on almost all his fingers and toes, some of them four or five inches long." Locke treasured up one

¹ *European Magazine*, vol. xv., p. 273; Locke to Mapletoft, [12—] 22 Dec. 1677. Locke's notes on this case were presented by Lord King to the Royal College of Physicians; but his letters contain more medical information than unprofessional readers are likely to care for.

of these excrescences, "which," he said, "was broke off in my presence," made full notes of the case in his journal, wrote about it to Boyle, and ultimately contributed his information to the Royal Society, which published it, with elaborate pictures, in the *Philosophical Transactions*.¹

In Paris, Locke made the acquaintance of several doctors, especially of Guenellon, a famous physician of Amsterdam, who was then in the French capital, and of several other men eminent in science and literature, the most notable of whom were Justel and Thoynard. Thoynard appears to have been his most intimate friend, and he was certainly the one with whom intimate friendship was longest maintained. We shall see much of their correspondence during the next quarter of a century.

Nicolas Thoynard, whose name was often spelt Toynard, both by himself and by his friends, was a man worth knowing. He was born at Orleans, where his father held a good position, in March, 1629, and was thus Locke's senior by three years and a half. As a youth, besides being a great linguist, he attracted notice by his success in mathematical and physical studies. Going to Paris when he was twenty-three, he chose law for his profession, but made science his chief pursuit, until he began to devote himself to biblical criticism and the study of Jewish chronology. He travelled much and resided often in his native town; but Paris was his favourite haunt. There in 1669 he began to print his 'Harmonie de l'Écriture Sainte,' which, however, was not published in a complete form until 1707, a year after his death.

¹ Boyle, 'Works,' vol. v., pp. 569, 570; Locke to Boyle, [27 July—] 6 Aug., 1678, and 16 June, 1679; *Philosophical Transactions*, vol. xix. (1698), p. 594.

He was plodding on at this work, but apparently taking more pleasure in mechanical experiments, inventing a new kind of gun, projecting a ship with two keels, and so forth, when Locke became acquainted with him in 1677 or 1678, and was introduced by him to Olaus Römer, the young Danish astronomer, then thirty-three years old, and continuing his studies in Paris, to Melchisédech Thévenot, the now elderly traveller and bibliophile, and to all the other scholars and men of science whom the great Colbert, the one wise statesman whom Louis the Fourteenth consented to use because he could not do without him, encouraged to reside in the metropolis of vice, and thus to save it from utter corruption.

What sort of intercourse Locke had with Thoynard and his friends may be inferred from one very interesting entry in his journal. "I saw by chance," he wrote, apparently in May, 1678, "an experiment which confirmed me in an opinion I have long had, that in fermentation a new air is generated. M. Thoynard produced a large bottle of muscat: it was clear when he set it on the table, but when he had drawn out the stopper, a multitude of little bubbles arose, and swelled the wine above the mouth of the bottle. It comes from this, that the air which was included and disseminated in the liquor had liberty to expand itself, and so to become visible and, being much lighter than the liquor, to mount with great quickness. Query, whether this be air new generated, or whether the springy particles of air in the fruits out of which these fermenting liquors are drawn, have by the artifice of nature been pressed close together and thereby other particles fastened and held so? and whether fermentation does not loose these bonds and give them liberty to expand themselves again? Take a bottle of fermenting

liquor and tie a bladder on the mouth ; query, how much new air will it produce ? whether this has the quality of common air ? ”¹

Locke’s scientific speculations did not restrain him from getting all the instruction that he could out of the more showy entertainments of Paris and its neighbourhood. But he was not spoilt by them. On the 16th of May, 1678, shortly before leaving Paris, he made a very characteristic entry in his journal, evidently suggested by the extravagant habits and the consequent disasters that were so prominently exhibited there. “ Sumptuary laws, where the age inclines to luxury, do not restrain but rather increase the evil. Perhaps the better way to set bounds to people’s expenses, and hinder them from spending beyond their income, would be to enact that no landed men should be obliged to pay any book-debt to tradesmen, whereby the interest of tradesmen would make them very cautious of trusting those who usually are the leaders of fashion, and thereby a great restraint would be brought on the usual excess : on the other hand, the credit of poor labouring people would be preserved as before, for the supply of their necessities.”²

As two of them were written from Paris, this seems the fittest place in which to quote three very notable letters that Locke addressed to one of his old friends, Denis Grenville, a member of the famous Cornish family which, with some differences of spelling, has produced a great many men of note between the reigns of Queen Elizabeth and Queen Victoria. About this particular Grenville we need not much concern ourselves. The letters are valuable as illustrations, not of his character, but of Locke’s ; and especially perhaps of the temper that Locke exhibited in

¹ Lord King, p. 116.

² *Ibid.*, p. 74.

his dealings with men and things during this French holiday.

The first letter has not come down to us in the exact shape in which it may have been despatched; but we have a draft of it entered roughly, according to a plan that Locke sometimes adopted, in his journal. It is there dated March, 1677:—

“As for recreation, thus I think; that, recreation being a thing ordained, not for itself, but for a certain end, that end is to be the rule and measure of it.

“Recreation then seeming to me to be the doing of some easy or at least delightful thing to restore the mind or body, tired with labour, to its former strength and vigour, and thereby fit it for new labour, it seems to me,—1st. That there can be no general rule set to different persons concerning the time, manner, duration, or sort of recreation that is to be used, but only that it be such as their experience tells them is suited to them, and proper to refresh the part tired. 2nd. That, if it be applied to the mind, it ought certainly to be delightful, because, it being to restore and enliven that, which is done by relaxing and composing the agitation of the spirits, that which delights it without employing it much is not only the fittest to do so, but also the contrary—*i.e.*, what is ungrateful doth certainly most discompose and tire it. 3rd. That it is impossible to set a standing rule of recreation to one's self; because not only the unsteady fleeting condition of our bodies and spirits requires more at one than another, which is plain in other more fixed refreshments, as food and sleep, and likewise requires very different according to the employment that hath preceded the present temper of our bodies and inclination of our minds; but also because variety in most constitutions is so necessary to delight, and the mind is so naturally tender of its freedom, that the most pleasant diversions become nauseous and troublesome to us when we are forced to repeat them in a continued fixed round.

“It is further to be considered:—1st. That in things not absolutely commanded nor forbidden by the law of God, such as is the material part of recreation, he in his mercy, considering our ignorance and frail constitution, hath not tied us to an indivisible point, nor confined us to a way so narrow that allows no latitude at all in things in their own nature indifferent; there is the liberty of great choice, great variety, within the bounds of innocence. 2nd. That God delights not to have us miserable either in this or the other world, but having given us all things richly to enjoy, we cannot imagine

that in our recreations we should be denied delight, which is the only necessary and useful part of it.

“This supposed, I imagine:—1st. That recreation supposes labour and weariness, and therefore that he that labours not hath no title to it. 2nd. That it very seldom happens that our constitutions (though there be some tender ones that require a great deal) require more time to be spent in recreation than in labour.

“We must beware that custom and the fashion of the world, or some other by-interest, doth not make that pass with us for recreation which is indeed labour to us, though it be not our business; as playing at cards, though no otherwise allowable but as a recreation, is so far from fitting some men for their business and giving them refreshment, that it more discomposes them than their ordinary labour.

“So that, God not tying us up of time, place, kind, etc., in our recreations, if we secure our main duty, which is in sincerity to do our duty in our calling as far as the frailty of our bodies or minds will allow us (beyond which we cannot think anything should be required of us), and that we design our diversions to put us in a condition to do our duty, we need not perplex ourselves with too scrupulous an inquiry into the precise bounds of them. For we cannot be supposed to be obliged to rules which we cannot know: for I doubt whether there be any such exact proportion of recreation to our present state of body and mind that so much is exactly enough, and whatsoever is under is too little, whatsoever is over is too much. But, be it so or no, this I am very confident of, that no one can say in his own or another man’s case that thus much is the precise dose; hitherto you must go and no further. So that it is not only our privilege, but we are under a necessity of using a latitude, and where we can discover no determined, precise rule, it is unavoidable for us to go sometimes beyond, and sometimes to stop short of, that which is I will not say the exact, but nearest proportion; and in such cases we can only govern ourselves by the discoverable bounds on the one hand or the other, which is only when we find that our recreation, by excess or defect, serves not to the proper end for which we are to use it, only with this caution, that we are to suspect ourselves most on that side to which we find ourselves most inclined. The cautious, devout, studious man, is to fear that he allows not himself enough; the gay, careless, and idle, that he takes too much.

“To which I can only add these following directions as to some particulars:—1st. That the properest time for recreating the mind is when it feels itself weary and flagging; it may be wearied with a thing when it is not weary

of it. 2nd. That the properest recreation of studious, sedentary persons, whose labour is of the thought, is bodily exercise; of those of bustling employment, sedentary recreations. 3rd. That in all bodily exercise, those in the open air are best for health. 4th. It may often be so ordered that one business may be made a recreation to another, visiting a friend to study.

“These are my sudden extemporaneous thoughts upon this subject, which will deserve to be better considered when I am in better circumstances of freedom, of thought, and leisure.”¹

That letter was written either just before Locke left Montpellier, or while he was on his way to Bordeaux. The next was dated from Paris, in March, 1677-8. Both it and the third letter we have in the form in which they were actually transmitted to Grenville, some important alterations being made in writing them out.

“SIR,—Shall I not pass with you for a great empiric if I offer but one remedy to the three maladies you complain of? Or at least will you not think me to use less care and application than becomes the name of friend you honour me with, if I think to make one answer serve the three papers you have sent me in matters very different? But yet, if it be found, as I imagine it will, that they all depend on the same causes, I believe you will think they will not need different cures.

“I conceive, then, that the great difficulty, uncertainty, and perplexity of thought you complain of in these particulars, arises in great measure from this ground, that you think that a man is obliged strictly and precisely at all times to do that which is absolutely best; and that there is always some action so incumbent upon a man, so necessary to be done, preferable to all others, that, if that be omitted, one certainly fails in one's duty, and all other actions whatsoever, otherwise good in themselves, yet coming in the place of some more important and better that at that time might be done, are tainted with guilt, and can be no more an acceptable offering to God than a blemished victim under the law.

“I confess our duty is sometimes so evident, and the rule and circumstances so determine it to the present performance, that there is no latitude left;

¹ Lord King, p. 323; Locke to D. G., March, 1677. Lord King also printed from his journal Locke's draft of the next letter and a portion of the third.

nothing ought at that time to come in the room of it. But this I think happens seldom, at least I may confidently say it does not in the greatest part of the actions of our lives, wherein I think God, out of his infinite goodness, considering our ignorance and frailty, hath left us a great liberty.

“Love to God and charity to ourselves and neighbours are, no doubt, at all times indispensably necessary : but while we keep these warm in our hearts, and sincerely practise what they upon occasion suggest to us, I cannot but think God allows us in the ordinary actions of our lives a great latitude ; so that, two or more things being proposed to be done, neither of which crosses that fundamental law, but may very well consist with the sincerity wherewith we love God and our neighbour, I think it is at our choice to do either of them.

“The reasons that make me of this opinion are :—1st. That I cannot imagine that God, who has compassion upon our weakness and knows how we are made, would put poor man, nay, the best of men, those that seek him with sincerity and truth, under almost an absolute necessity of sinning perpetually against him, which will almost inevitably follow if there be no latitude at all allowed us in the occurrences of our lives, but that every instant of our being in the world has always incumbent on it one certain action exclusive of all others. For according to this supposition, the best being always to be done, and that being but one, it is almost impossible to know which is that one, there being so many actions which may all have some peculiar and considerable goodness, which we are at the same time capable of doing, and so many nice circumstances and considerations to be weighed one against another, before we can come to make any judgment which is best ; and after all I shall be in danger to be mistaken : the comparison of those actions that stand in competition together, with all their grounds, motives, and consequences as they lie before us, being very hard to be made. And what makes the difficulty yet far greater is, that a great many of those which are of moment, and should come into the reckoning, always escape us ; our short sight never penetrating far enough into any action to discover all that is comparatively good or bad in it. Besides that, the extent of our thoughts is not able to reach all those actions which at any one time we are capable of doing ; so that at last, when we come to choose which is best, in making our judgment upon wrong and scanty measures, we cannot secure ourselves from being in the wrong. This is so evident in all the consultations of mankind, that should you pick out any number of the best and wisest men you could think of, to deliberate in almost any case what were best to be done, you should find them make almost all different propositions, wherein one (if one) only lighting on what

is best, all the rest acting by the best of their skill and caution, would have been sinners as missing of that one best. The apostles themselves were not always of one mind.

“ 2nd. I cannot conceive it to be the design of God, nor to consist with either his goodness or our business in the world, to clog every action of our lives, even the minutest of them (which will follow, if one thing that is best is always to be done), with infinite consideration before we begin it, and unavoidable perplexity and doubt when it is done. When I sat down to write to you this hasty account, before I set pen to paper, I might have considered whether it were best for me ever to meddle with the answering your questions or no. My want of ability, it being beside my business, the difficulty of advising anybody, and presumption of advising one so far above me, would suggest doubts enough. Next, I might have debated with myself whether it were best to take time to answer your demands, or, as I do, set presently to it. Thirdly, whether there were not somewhat better that I could do at this time. Fourthly, I might doubt whether it were best to read any books upon these subjects before I gave you my opinion, or to send you my own naked thoughts. To those a thousand other scruples, as considerable, might be added, which would still beget others, in every one of which there would be, no doubt, still a better and a worse; which, if I should sit down and with serious consideration endeavour to find and determine clearly and precisely with myself to the minutest differences, before I betake myself to give you an answer, perhaps my whole age might be spent in the deliberation about writing two sides of paper to you, and I should perpetually blot out one word and put in another, rase to-morrow what I write to-day; for it is not an easy matter, even when one is resolved to write, to know what words, expressions, and arguments are the very best to be made use of. Whereas, having this single consideration of complying with the desire of a friend whom I honour, and whose desires I think ought to weigh with me, and one who persuades me too that I have an opportunity of doing him some pleasure in it, I cannot think I ought to be so scrupulous in the point, or neglect obeying your commands, though I cannot be sure but that I might do better not to offer you my opinions, which may be mistakes; and probably I should do better to employ my thoughts how to be able to cure you of a quartan ague, or to cure in myself some other and more dangerous faults, which is more properly my business. But my intention being respect and service to you, and all the designs of my writing comporting with the love I owe to God and my neighbour, I should be very well satisfied with what I write, could I but be as well assured it would be useful as I am past doubt it is lawful, and that I have

the liberty to do it; and yet I cannot say, and I believe you will not think, it is the best thing I could do. If we were never to do but what is absolutely best, all our lives would go away in deliberation, and we should never come to action.

“3rd. I have often thought that our state here in this world is a state of mediocrity, which is not capable of extremes, though on one side there may be great excellency and perfection. Thus we are not capable of continual rest or continual exercise, though the latter has certainly much more of excellency in it. We are not able to labour always with the body, nor always with the mind; and, to come to our present purpose, we are not capable of living altogether exactly by a strict rule, nor altogether without one—not always retired, nor always in company. But this being but an odd notion of mine, it may suffice only to have mentioned it, my authority being no great argument in the case; only give me leave to say, that if it holds true, it will be applicable in several cases, and be of use to us in the conduct of our lives and actions.

“But I have been too long already to enlarge on this fancy any farther at present. As to our actions in general things, this in short I think: 1st. That all negative precepts are always to be obeyed. 2nd. That positive commands only sometimes upon occasions. But we ought always to be furnished with the habits and dispositions to those positive duties in a readiness against those occasions. 3rd. That between these two, *i.e.*, between unlawful, which are always, and necessary, *quoad hic et nunc*, which are but sometimes, there is a great latitude, and therein we have our liberty, which we may use without scrupulously thinking ourselves obliged to that which in itself may be best.

“If this be so, as I question not but you will conclude with me it is, the greatest cause of your scruples and doubts, I suppose, will be removed; and so the difficulties in the cases proposed will in a good measure be removed too. When I know from you whether I have guessed right or no, I may be encouraged also in all the cases you propose; but, being of much less moment than this I have mentioned here, they may be deferred to another time, and then considered *en passant*, before we come to take up the particular cases separately.

“I am, reverend sir, your most humble servant,

“J. LOCKE.”¹

¹ *Additional MSS.* in the British Museum, no. 4290; Locke to Denis Grenville, [18—] 23 March, 1677-8; “from the originals in the possession of Richard Rawlinson, LL.D.”

The third letter was written after Locke's return to Paris, in November, 1678.

“SIR,—By yours of 21st of November, you assure me that in my last, on this occasion, I hit right on the original and principal cause of some disquiet you had in yourself upon the matters under consideration. I should have been glad to have known, also, whether the cure I there offered at was any ways effectual; or wherein the reasons I gave came short of that satisfaction and establishment, as to the point, viz., that we are not obliged to do always that which is precisely best, as was desired. For I think it properest to the subduing those enemies of our quiet—fears, doubts and scruples—to do as those who design the conquest of new territories, viz., to clear the country as we go, and leave behind us no enemies unmastered, no garrisons unreduced, no lurking-holes unsearched, which may give occasions to disorder and insurrections, or excite disturbances.

“If, therefore, in that, or any of my other papers, any of my arguments and reasonings shall appear weak or obscure; if they reach not the bottom of the matter, are wide of your particular case, or have not so cleared up the question in all the parts and extent of it, as to settle the truth with evidence and certainty; I must beg you to do me the favour to let me know what doubts still remain, and upon what reasons grounded, that so in our progress we may look upon those propositions that you are once thoroughly convinced of to be settled and established truths, of which you are not to doubt any more without new reasons that have not yet been examined, or, on the other side, that by your answers to my reasons I may be set right and recovered from an error. For as I write you nothing but my own thoughts (which is vanity enough—but you will have it so), yet I am not so vain as to imagine them infallible, and therefore expect from you that mutual great office of friendship, to show me my mistakes, and to reason me into a better understanding; for it matters not on which side the truth lies, so we do but find it and embrace it.

“This way of proceeding is necessary on both our accounts; on mine, because in my friendship with you, as well as others, I design to gain by the bargain that which I esteem the greatest benefit of friendship, the rectifying my mistakes and errors, which makes me so willingly expose my crude extemporary thoughts to your view, and lay them, such as they are, naked before you: and on your account also I think it very necessary, for your mind having been long accustomed to think it true that the thing absolutely in itself best ought always indispensably to be done, you ought, in order to

the establishing your peace, perfectly to examine and clear up that question, so as at the end of the debate to retain it still for true, or perfectly reject it as a mistaken or wrong measure; and to settle it as a maxim in your mind, that you are no more to govern yourself or thoughts by that false rule, but wholly lay it aside as condemned, without putting yourself to the trouble, every time you reflect on it, to recall into your mind and weigh again all those reasons upon which you made the conclusion; and so also in any other opinions and principles you have had, when you come once to be convinced of their falsehood.

“If this be not done, it will certainly happen that the above-mentioned principle (and so of the rest), having been for a long time settled in your head, will, upon every occasion, recur; and, the reasons upon which you rejected it not being so familiar to your thoughts, nor so ready at hand to oppose it, the old acquaintance will be apt to resume his former station and influence, and to disturb that quiet which had not its foundation perfectly established.

“For these reasons it is that I think we ought to clear all as we go, and come to a plenary result in all the propositions that come under debate, before we go any farther. This has been usually my way with myself, to which, I think, I owe a great part of my quiet; and, I believe, a few good principles, well established, will reach farther, and resolve more doubts, than at first sight perhaps one would imagine; and the grounds and rules on which the right and wrong of our actions turn, and which will generally serve to conduct us in the cares and occurrences of our lives, in all states and conditions, lie possibly in a narrower compass, and in a less number, than is ordinarily supposed. But, to come to them, one must go by sure and well-grounded steps.

“This being premised, I come to make good my promise to you in mentioning what I guess may be another cause of your doubts, unsteadiness and disturbances in the points under consideration; and that, I suppose, is that you think those things inconsistent that in themselves I judge are not so, worldly business and devotion, study and conversation, and recreation withal; as if the most material of these deserved, or the present and most pressing so possessed the whole man, that it left no room, no time for any of the others.

“This, if it has had any influence upon your mind to disturb it (as it seems to me by some passages in your papers it has), is not yet of that weight and difficulty as that I before mentioned, and I am apt to think that a few easy and natural considerations will be sufficient to remove it, and to get quite rid of this (if any) ground of disturbance and scruple and unsettledness.

And for this we need only reflect a little upon the state and condition that it hath pleased God to place us in here in this world.

“1st. We are not born in heaven, but in this world, where our being is to be preserved with meat, drink, and clothing and other necessaries that are not born with us, but must be got and kept with forecast, care, and labour, and therefore we cannot be all devotion, all praises and hallelujahs, and perpetually in the vision of things above. That is reserved for another state and place. Had it been otherwise, God would not have put us in a condition where we are obliged to use all means of preserving ourselves in that condition (*i.e.*, this life), not to be had without thoughtfulness and service, without employing upon the search of them the greatest part of our time and care. For, at a less rate, the greatest part of mankind can hardly subsist in this world, especially this civilized world, wherein you are obliged to keep your rank and station, and which if by mismanagement or neglect of your temporal affairs you fall from, you by your own fault put yourself out of a condition of doing that good and performing those offices required from one in that station.

“2nd. We are not placed in this world to stay here for ever, or without any concernment beyond it, and therefore we are not to lay out all our thoughts and time upon it and the concernments of it. The author of our being and all our good here, and the much greater good of another world, deserves and demands frequent addresses to him of thanks, prayer and resignation, and our concernments in another world make it reason, wisdom and duty so to do.

“3rd. We are born with ignorance of those things that concern the conduct of our lives in this world, in order to retaining what we desire or is useful to us in this world or we hope in the next, and therefore inquiry, study and meditation is necessary, without which a great part of necessary knowledge is not to be had, especially in some callings.

“4th. We are born with dispositions to and desires of society; we are by nature fitted for it; and religion increases the obligation. We are born members of commonwealths, beset with relations, and in need of friends, and under a necessity of acquaintance; which requiring of us the mutual offices of familiarity, friendship and charity, we cannot spend all our time in retired devotion or study, nor in a plodding or taking care of our worldly affairs, *i.e.*, that *viaticum* which is to serve us or those we are to provide for through this pilgrimage, or something in order to it.

“5th. We are so framed, so constituted, that any employment of mind, any exercise of body, will weary and unfit us to continue longer in that employment. The springs by which all our operations are performed are finite,

and have their utmost extent, and when they approach that, like watches that have gone till their force is spent, we stand still, or move to little purpose, if not wound up again. And thus, after labour of mind or body, we have need of recreation to set us going again with fresh vigour and activity.

“This is not all on this subject; but 'tis time to repose you till another season. 'Tis enough to satisfy you that I am yours,

“J. LOCKE.”¹

It certainly seems strange that Denis Grenville, a clergyman, should have gone to Locke, a layman, for advice on the subjects of those letters; and it is clear that he did not profit much by them. Having as soon as he left Oxford married a daughter of Dr. John Cosin, bishop of Durham, who died in 1674, we are told that he had “several spiritualities conferred upon him by that worthy bishop.” One of these was a chaplaincy-in-ordinary to King Charles the Second. In 1684 he was made dean of Durham; but, like most other courtiers, he turned papist. For refusing to take the oaths of allegiance to William and Mary, he was ejected in 1691. His exiled monarch, James the Second, appointed him catholic archbishop of York; but he never got possession of his see.²

Locke left Paris, intending to go leisurely to Montpellier and thence on to Rome, at the end of June, 1678; this extension of his holiday being probably projected especially for the benefit of Sir John Banks's son, and at the rich merchant's charge.

He reached Orleans about the 1st of July, and on the

¹ *Additional MSS.*, no. 4290; Locke to Grenville, [27 Nov.—] 6 Dec., 1678.

² Wood, ‘*Athenæ Oxonienses*,’ vol. iv., col. 498; ‘*Fasti Oxonienses*,’ part ii., cols. 229, 326.

4th wrote a lively letter to Thoynard. "Truly, sir, though one may be out of reach of your guns," he said, in allusion to his friend's fondness for inventing new sorts of firearms, "one cannot get free from obligations to you. After all the favours you conferred upon me in Paris, I find myself here in Orleans loaded with favours conferred upon me by your friends." He then named some of these friends, especially M. de Rebours, M. Perot, M. Godefroi, and the Abbé Gendron. "M. Godefroi did me the honour to invite me to sup with him; but, as my companion waited supper for me at our lodgings, I was obliged to excuse myself. M. l'Abbé Gendron, whom I think one of the greatest men of his age, was the last whom I had the honour to see, and, having been two or three times at his door without gaining access to him, I feared that, like the impotent man at Bethesda, I should remain inconsolable for want of some one to help me into that place of safety. I knew well that the garçon who came to the door was not a good angel, for he did not know you; he always told me his master was in the country. But at last your letter opened the door, and I entered with great joy."¹

Locke halted more than a fortnight at Orleans. He was at Blois on the 27th of July, whence he wrote a letter to Boyle, repeating, among other matters, some scientific gossip which he had received, probably from Thoynard. "I have news from Paris, from an ingenious acquaintance of mine there, that a friend of his hath found out a very

¹ *Additional MSS.* in the British Museum, no. 28728; Locke to Thoynard, [4—] 14 July, 1678. There are the originals or copies of fifty-six of Locke's letters to Thoynard, written sometimes in French, sometimes in Latin. In translating I have taken the liberty of curtailing merely complimentary phrases, without, I hope, misrepresenting the real purport of the letters.

sensible hygrometer which, besides marking the moistness of the air, will also be improved to wind up a pendulum; which, if it succeeds, will be a kind of perpetual motion. And a watchmaker I know there sends me word that he is now at work upon a movement that the air will wind up; which, I suppose, is the execution of the design my friend, who is a very good mechanic, besides an admirable scholar, sent me notice of. He also mentioned to me the extraordinary goodness of a microscope Mr. Huyghens has brought with him out of Holland. But, these things having happened in Paris since I left it, I cannot give you so perfect an account of them as I desire. Amongst other things, I have a small quantity of a medicine given me, which I believe to be of great efficacy to certain purposes, whereof you will perhaps not be displeased to see the effects. I was extremely pleased to hear that the things sent to me from the Bahamas were put into your hands. They could not have been placed anywhere so much to advantage and to my desire.”¹

Travelling westward from Blois, along the banks of the Loire, Locke was disappointed by the poverty-stricken appearance of the country. “Many of the towns they call bourgs,” he wrote in his journal; “but, considering how poor and few the houses in most of them are, would in England scarce amount to villages. The houses generally were but one story; and, though such low buildings cost not much to keep them up, yet, like grovelling bodies without souls, they also sink lower when they want inhabitants, of which sort of ruins we saw great numbers in all these bourgs, whereby one would guess that the

¹ Boyle, ‘Works,’ vol. v., p. 569; Locke to Boyle, [27 July—] 6 Aug., 1678.

people of France do not at present increase; but yet the country is all tilled and cultivated. The gentlemen's seats, of which we saw many, were most of them bearing marks of decay than of thriving and being well kept, except the great Chateau de Richelieu, the most complete piece of building in France, where on the outside is exact symmetry, in the inside convenience, riches and beauty, the richest gilding, the finest statues."¹

He entered Angers on the 9th of August, and next day he called on the Abbé Troger, with a note of introduction from Thoynard, to whom he wrote immediately after to report progress. "Truly your abbés are wonderful, and if all the abbés in France were as good as those with whom you have made me acquainted at Orleans, at Angers, and in Paris, none others would be so delightful as this sort of people. I expect to leave this in a week for La Rochelle. They speak in these quarters of Rochefort as a place better worth seeing than any other in France."²

Two days later he wrote to ask the same friend's advice about the route that he should take. "I am anxious to use my journey in making a complete acquaintance with the districts through which I pass, and to neglect nothing curious or rare, as often happens to strangers ill-advised."³

Of his adventures and observations, however, we have not much information until, having passed southward through La Rochelle and Rochefort, he reached Bordeaux on the 5th of September. All along the road he saw marks of poverty and degradation, consequent on the

¹ Lord King, p. 75.

² *Additional MSS.*, no. 28836; Locke to Thoynard, [10—] 20 Aug., 1678.

³ *Ibid.*; Locke to Thoynard, [12—] 22 Aug., 1678.

bad government of the country, and aggravated, of course, by the long warfare in which Louis the Fourteenth was engaged. "We rode abroad a league or two," Locke wrote in his journal while at Bordeaux, "into the country westward, which they call Grave, from whence comes the Grave wine—all vineyard. Talking with a poor peasant, he told me he had three children, that he usually got seven sous, finding himself, which was to maintain their family, five in number. His wife got three sous, when she could get work, which was seldom; other times the spinning, which was for their cloth, yielded more money. Out of these seven sous they five were to be maintained, and house-rent paid, and their *taille*, and Sundays and holidays provided for. For their house (which, God wot, was a poor, one-room, one-story, open to the tiles, without windows) and a little vineyard (which was as bad as nothing, for, though they made out of it four or five tierce of wine, yet the labour and cost about the vineyard, making the wine, and cost of the casks to put it in, being cast up, the profit of it was very little), they paid twelve écus for rent, and for *taille* four livres—for which, not long since, the collector had taken their frying-pan and dishes, money not being ready."¹

Those statistics are worth analysing. Threepence half-penny a day in English money, or, allowing for Sundays and holidays, about eighteenpence a week, say, eighty shillings a year; from which were to be deducted twelve half-crowns for rent and three and fourpence for taxes: say a net income of forty-six shillings for five human beings to feed and clothe themselves upon; barely more than nine shillings a head throughout the year; barely more than a farthing a day! Of course, a farthing two centuries

¹ Lord King, p. 76.

ago bought more than a farthing now can buy; but how much? God wot, indeed. It would seem as if the frying-pan and dishes seized by the collector might very well be spared in that household. "Their ordinary food," Locke added, with grim compactness of phrase, "rye bread and water. Flesh seldom seasons their pots. They can make no distinction between flesh and fasting days. But when their money reaches to a more costly meal"—perhaps when the wife has brought another three-halfpence into the family exchequer by a hard day's toil—"they buy the inwards of some beast in the market, and then they feast themselves. In several other parts of France the peasants are much more miserable: the peasants who live in Grave they count to be flourishing."¹

Of course feudal institutions had to be supported. Of course Louis the Fourteenth had to make war upon the Netherlanders, and to bribe Charles the Second and English politicians to join him in the crusade against all protestants. Of course Madame de Montespan and her rivals had to be maintained at Versailles, and every country nobleman and bishop had to be provided with plenty of money for his courtesans. But one wonders how it was that the French Revolution was so long delayed.

"Saw the Carthusian convent a quarter of a mile without the town," Locke also wrote while he was at Bordeaux; "the altar adorned with pillars of the finest marble that I have seen; the marble of so excellent a kind (interlaced with veins, as it were, of gold), that the king hath been tempted to send for them away." And on his way out of Bordeaux, on the 16th of September, "Saw the great chateau, built by the Duc d'Esperton, built on three sides of a court, as all the great houses in

¹ Lord King, p. 76.

France are, four stories high and much more capacious than the chateau of Richelieu.”¹

Passing through Toulouse, Locke reached Montpellier early in October. But he stayed there hardly more than a week. “If all the world should go to Rome, I think I should never,” he wrote to Mapletoft from Lyons, “having been twice firmly bent upon it, the time set, the company agreed, and as many times defeated. I came hither in all haste from Montpellier with the same design, but old Father Winter, armed with all his snow and icicles, keeps guard on Mont Cenis and will not let me pass. Were I not accustomed to have fortune to dispose of me contrary to my design and expectation, I should be very angry to be thus turned out of my way, when I imagined myself almost at the suburbs of Rome, and made sure in a few days to mount the Capitol and trace the footsteps of the Scipios and the Cæsars; but I am made to know ’tis a bold thing to be projecting of things for to-morrow, and that it is fit such a slight bubble as I am should let itself be carried at the fancy of wind and tide, without pretending to direct its own motion. I think I shall learn to do so hereafter. This is the surest way to be at ease.”²

In that philosophic mood Locke went back to Paris, where, arriving about the middle of November, he remained till near the end of the following April. The philosophic mood seems to have remained with him while he renewed his acquaintance with the gaities and shows of Paris, as well as with its scientific and literary society. “The principal spring from which the actions of

¹ Lord King, p. 77.

² *European Magazine*, vol. xv. (1789), p. 353; Locke to Mapletoft, [29 Oct.—] 8 Nov., 1678. Part of this letter was incorrectly printed in the second edition of Lord King’s ‘Life of Locke.’

men take their rise, the rule they conduct them by, and the end to which they direct them," he wrote in his journal on the 2nd of December, "seems to be credit and reputation, and that which at any rate they avoid is in the greatest part shame and disgrace. This makes the Hurons and other people of Canada with such constancy endure inexpressible torments. This makes merchants in one country and soldiers in another. This puts men upon school divinity in one country and physics and mathematics in another. This cuts out the dresses for the women and makes the fashions for the men, and makes them endure the inconveniences of all. This makes men drunkards and sober, thieves and honest, and robbers themselves true to one another. Religions are upheld by this, and factions maintained; and the shame of being disesteemed by those with whom one hath lived, and to whom one would recommend one's self, is the great source and director of most of the actions of men. Where riches are in credit, knavery and injustice that produce them are not out of countenance, because, the state being got, esteem follows it, as in some countries the crown ennobles the blood. Where power, and not the good exercise of it, gives reputation, all the injustice, falsehood, violence and oppression that attains that goes for wisdom and ability. Where love of one's country is the thing in credit, there we shall see a race of brave Romans; and, when being a favourite at court was the only thing in fashion, one may observe the same race of Romans all turned flatterers and informers. He therefore that would govern the world well had need consider rather what fashions he makes than what laws, and to bring anything into use, he need only give it reputation."¹

¹ Lord King, p. 108.

The fashions more powerful than laws that prevailed in Paris did not seem to Locke very commendable. "At the king's *levée*," he wrote on the 13th of December, "which I saw this morning at St. Germain's, there is nothing so remarkable as his great devotion, which is very exemplary; for, as soon as ever he is dressed, he goes to his bedside, where he kneels down to his prayers, several priests kneeling by him, in which posture he continues for a pretty while, not being disturbed by the noise and buzz of the rest of the chamber, which is full of people talking to one another."¹ Locke believed that every good man must be a religious man, and that special acts of devotion ought to be joined to the constant worship of good deeds; but he did not like hypocrisy.

Little need be said about his occupations during these last months in Paris. Lodging, as he had done before, over an apothecary's shop in the Faubourg St. Germain's, but a few minutes' walk from Thoynard's residence, in the same faubourg, he seems to have chiefly spent his time among his scientific and literary friends.

On one day we find him examining the library of the great protestant De Thou, better known perhaps as Thuanus, which was then about to be sold. "Here I had the honour to see the Prince of Conti, now in his seventeenth year, a very comely young gentleman; but the beauty of his mind far excels that of his body, being for his age very learned. He speaks Italian and German as a native, understands Latin well, Spanish indifferently, and is, as I am told, going to learn English: a great lover of justice and honour, very civil and obliging to all, and desires the acquaintance of persons of merit of any kind."¹

On another day he is at the Capuchin convent in the

¹ Lord King, p. 78.

² *Ibid.*, p. 81.

Rue St. Honoré. "I saw the Père Cherubin, the Capuchin so famous for optics, at least the practical part in telescopes. The Capuchins are the strictest and severest order in France, so that, to mortify those of their order, they command them the most unreasonable things, irrational and ridiculous,—as to plant cabbage-plants the roots upwards, and then reprehend them, the planters, because they do not grow. As soon as they find any one to have any inclinations any way, as Père Cherubin in optics and telescopes, they take from him all that he has done or may be useful to him in that science and employ him in something quite contrary; but he has now a particular lock and key to his cell, which the guardian's key opens not. This severity makes them not compassionate one to another, whatever they would be to others."¹

From the letter that Locke wrote to him while at Lyons, which has been already quoted from, we learn that Mapletoft, who had always shown some inclination to enter the church, was now abandoning his medical practice and thinking of resigning his professorship at Gresham College. "I cannot tell how to blame your design," wrote Locke; "but I must confess to you I like our calling the worse since you have quitted it; yet I hope it is not to make way for another, which, with more indissoluble chains, has greater cares and solitudes accompanying it. If it be so, you need be well prepared with philosophy, and you may find it necessary sometimes to take a dram of Tully 'De Consolatione.' I cannot forbear to touch, *en passant*, the chapter of matrimony, which methinks you are still hankering after; but, if ever you should chance so to be given up as to marry, and, like other loving husbands, tell your wife who has dissuaded

¹ Lord King, p. 83.

you, what a case shall I be in ! All my comfort is that 'tis no personal malice to the woman, and I am sure I have nothing but friendship for you."¹

The date is torn off Locke's next letter to Mapletoft, but it was evidently written from Paris in the spring of 1679. From it it appears that Mapletoft had been thinking of travelling in France for the benefit of his health, just when Locke was about to return to England. "I am pleased to find you still at Gresham College, which I count a much better lodging, not only than the finest churchyard in London, but even than the best house in Montpellier, and I should have taken it mighty ill of your lungs to have sent you off an errant thither, especially at a time when I had patched up mine so well as to hope they would hold your strong London air and allow me again the happiness of your conversation, after another fashion than this niggardly way of letter. You oblige me by the promise you give me that I shall find you plump at my return. I desire it may not be interpreted by comparing yourself with me ; for I doubt whether all the ortolans in France be able to communicate to me one grain of their fat, and I shall be well enough at my ease if, when I return, I can but maintain this poor tenement of mine in the same repair it is at present, without hope ever to find it much better. For I expect not that Dr. Time should be half so favourable to my crazy body as it has been to you in your late disease. 'Tis a good mark, but may have other dangers in it ; for usually those whom that old winged gentleman helps up the hill are not yet got out of the reach of the winged boy who does such mischief with his bow and arrows."²

¹ *European Magazine*, vol. xv. (1789), p. 353 ; Locke to Mapletoft, [29 Oct.—] 8 Nov., 1678.

² *Ibid.*, p. 90 ; Locke to Mapletoft (date torn off).

Though he was not very hopeful about himself, Locke seems to have been in better health now than for some years past. As it had been arranged that he should return to England this spring, there was therefore no reason why he should prolong his already unexpectedly protracted sojourn in France, especially as his presence was urgently desired in England by Lord Shaftesbury.

He saw the last of Paris on the 22nd of April. On that day he rode as far as Clermont, on the 23rd he reached Amiens, on the 24th he was at Abbeville, on the 25th he passed through Montreuil to Boulogne, and on the 26th he arrived at Calais.¹

“You are surely,” he wrote thence to Thoynard, “the best of friends and the worst of comforters. From Paris to this place I have been as miserable as possible at the loss I endured in leaving you. My heart was so heavy that my beast stumbled under me, and I scarcely could find a posthorse that would gallop under such a load, though everybody says they are capital horses, and accustomed to bear men much larger than I am. That, however, is one of the least troubles of a man who has neither the wish nor the power to remove himself from your affection. As soon as I put my foot on the ground here, I begin to think of the pleasant conversation we used to have together, and of all that I should gain from you if I were with you always; and I assure you these thoughts distress me a good deal more than a horse that hobbles at every step. While I was in this poor state of mind, discontented with my journey, with Calais, with myself and with everything, your letter arrived and I opened it, when, lo! I found nothing but a history of the

¹ *Additional MSS.*, no. 15642, in the British Museum; Locke's diary for 1679.

entertainments going on in Paris. That is poor consolation for a man who has left your city, and who derives no pleasure from the prospect of returning to his native land.”¹

How much of that last sentence was merely complimentary, and how far it expressed a real preference for France over England as a place of residence, can hardly be determined. Locke was fond of saying civil things to his friends, and he seems always, on losing any pleasure, to have been apt to magnify that pleasure to the disparagement of others in the uncertain future.

In that letter Locke made allusion to John Brisbane, who was secretary to Ambassador Montague, and with whom he appears to have been on very intimate terms. The day before Locke left Paris, Brisbane added an odd postscript to a letter addressed by him to Henry Coventry, then secretary of state to Charles the Second. “Mr. Locke, who will deliver this to you, is a person of extraordinary good parts and a very honest man. If you make any trial of him, you will find it so.”² Secretary Coventry was Lord Shaftesbury’s brother-in-law, and had doubtless found out long before that Locke was an honest man and a person of good parts.

Locke started from Calais for London in the yacht *Charlotte*, at eleven o’clock on the 28th of April; and, being detained in the Thames for a day, by lack of wind, landed at the Temple stairs on the 30th of the month.³

¹ *Additional MSS.*, no. 28836; Locke to Thoynard, [27 April—] 7 May, 1679.

² The letter is among the Marquis of Bath’s family papers at Longleat; cited in the Fourth Report of the Historical Manuscripts Commission (1874), Appendix, p. 243.

³ *Additional MSS.*, no. 15642.

CHAPTER VIII.

WITH LORD SHAFTESBURY AGAIN.

[1679—1684.]

THE Earl of Shaftesbury, having been dismissed from the lord chancellorship two years before Locke went to France, had, during that time, and for some time after, become more and more alienated from Charles the Second and the court party, which was really the catholic party, and, as has been noted, had actually spent a year in the Tower as punishment for his efforts to thwart the treacherous and tyrannical policy of the king and his advisers. From the autumn of 1673 till the spring of 1678 the policy represented during most of the period by the Earl of Danby had been triumphant, and its triumph had brought England into worse degradation than it had suffered during any of the disgraceful years before. But a crisis, very brief and insufficient in itself, though the prelude of the far more momentous crisis that ten years afterwards placed William of Orange on the throne, occurred in 1678, when the eyes of the people were at length partially opened to the contemptible vices of King Charles, and to the schemes encouraged or sanctioned by him for bringing England into political vassalage to France, and religious vassalage to Rome. In that first crisis, Shaftesbury was to some small extent, and for some

short time, the hero. It was he, more than any other man, who procured the impeachment of Danby; and when, in the spring of 1679, a new scheme of government by a reorganised privy council was formally adopted by the king, he was appointed its president.

In anticipation of that appointment, probably as soon as he saw his way to a return to power, he invited Locke to come back to England and to resume his former relations with him as adviser upon all affairs of public importance. Locke did so, it would seem, with as little delay as possible.¹

Arriving in London, as we have seen, on the last day of April, 1679, he proceeded at once to Thanet House, in Aldersgate-street,² where Shaftesbury now resided when he was in town, and there or elsewhere he was in frequent attendance on the earl during the next two years at any rate. Unfortunately we have very little information about his connection with public affairs during these and the following years. The stray details that have come down to us fully justify the inference that he was intimately concerned in all the important business of the time, often serving Shaftesbury, not only as his adviser, but also as his agent; but we are not able to follow him step by step through these movements, and must be

¹ "In the year 1679," said Lady Masham, in her letter to Le Clerc, "the Earl of Shaftesbury being made lord president of the council, Mr. Locke was sent for home." Locke had evidently arranged some weeks before to bring to a close his sojourn in France, already protracted far beyond its intended limits, and as he had left Paris before Shaftesbury's appointment was made, he was probably first informed of it on his arrival in London. It may be supposed, however, that the crisis in public affairs that issued in the formation of the new privy council had caused him, at Shaftesbury's request, to hurry home when he did.

² *Additional MSS.*, no. 15642.

satisfied with such occasional illustrations as have been preserved.¹

However zealously he may have worked in the service of his friend and his country, however, it is evident that he did so with but faint hope of any good resulting from his or any other patriot's toil. The state of public affairs had considerably altered during his three and a half years' absence from England, and the changes that had taken place in himself made these alterations seem even greater than they really were. When, in 1675, he went to France to seek relief from his bodily ailments, he must have been sick at heart on account of the utterly diseased condition of his country. But till then he was so closely mixed up, through his relations with Lord Shaftesbury, though not by much that was said or done by himself, with public business, that he must necessarily have regarded that business in the spirit of a partisan, rather than as an impartial observer. While in France, he was able to look without any bias upon the court vices, religious frauds and corrupt statecraft that by direct effort and indirect example had already brought England so near to the verge of ruin. When he came home, he was able to gauge very much more accurately than heretofore the true condition of the political society in which he had again to move, and by which his own movements were to be very materially influenced.

It was only a few days before Locke returned to England that Shaftesbury had been appointed president of the

¹ The *Shaftesbury Papers*, which throw much light on Locke's connection with Shaftesbury between 1667 and 1675, are so incomplete for the later period as to be of comparatively little value. It is probable that the earl and his friends found it expedient to destroy all the important papers likely to implicate them with the government and its catholic supporters.

new privy council, a body which, it had been arranged, was to comprise, besides the president, thirty members, half of them state officials, the other half independent members of the two houses of parliament, and was to be cognisant of all the king's proceedings, and to advise with him thereon, the committee, cabal or cabinet, which undertook the details of government, being subordinate to it.

When Locke reached Thanet House, the all-important subject of discussion, not only there, but in parliament and throughout the country, was as to the choice of an heir to Charles the Second. None but the king and the catholics favoured the claim of the Duke of York, who had been practically excluded, but not sufficiently to satisfy his opponents, by the Test Act. On Sunday, the 27th of April, the house of commons newly elected in succession to the house that had sat from 1661 till January 1678-9, resolved, without a dissentient, on the motion of John Hampden, that "the Duke of York's being a papist, and the hopes of his coming such to the crown, has given the greatest countenance and encouragement to the present conspiracies and designs of the papists against the king and the protestant religion;" and on the same day the preliminaries for the indictment of the duke as chief of the papist plotters were agreed upon. "If you will have the Duke of York come to the crown as other kings do, speak plain English," said one member of the house; "for, if you intend that, I will prepare to be a papist." Others declined to hint, even in sneers, at such pliancy. "If we do not something relating to the successor," said Lord Russell, "we must resolve, when we have a prince of the popish religion, to be papists or burn. I will do neither,"—a prophecy grimly fulfilled for him in the letter, when, four years afterwards, he was

beheaded instead of being burned. On the following Sunday, the 4th of May, the house resolved on a bill "to disable the Duke of York to inherit the crown of England," and this exclusion bill was read a second time on the 21st of May. At the end of the month the king suddenly prorogued the recalcitrant parliament; and in July the prorogation was exchanged for a dissolution, both prorogation and dissolution being resorted to in spite of the angry opposition of nearly all the members of the privy council, with Shaftesbury at their head. These violent measures, however, only caused the hateful discussion that provoked them to be carried on more hotly out of doors, and the projects that grew out of it to be considered, at once more secretly and more boldly, by the leading politicians of the day, most boldly and least secretly by the Earl of Shaftesbury, who now and till his death warmly supported the candidature of the king's son, the Duke of Monmouth, in opposition to that put forward, on the Prince of Orange's behalf, by Halifax, Sunderland, Temple, and others.

That was the business in which Locke came home to assist his friend; but the nature and extent of his assistance are not recorded. We know little more than that from the beginning of May till the middle of August, except during a fortnight's holiday in June, he was overwhelmed with work at Thanet House, and that he was with Shaftesbury very often in the ensuing months and years, although, as Shaftesbury ceased to attend the meetings of the privy council in August, having so soon found that it was only another shallow device for attempting to hoodwink the country as to the real tactics of the king and the catholic party, and as he was dismissed from his short presidency on the 15th of October,

he had less occasion for Locke's constant presence with him than he had anticipated in the spring. That he objected to Locke's absence, when that was necessary, and that, whether present or absent, Locke was his confidant and adviser, as well as his gossiping correspondent, two letters that have been preserved will help to show.

The first was written from London, at the close of the winter of 1679-80, when, as Shaftesbury was waiting for an opportunity of prudent action, he had not much work for Locke to do, and when Locke, forced by ill-health to keep out of London, was visiting his friends in Somersetshire, after passing some time at Oxford.

“MR. LOCKE,—We long to see you here, and hope you have almost ended your travels. Somersetshire, no doubt, will perfect your breeding; after France and Oxford, you could not go to a more proper place. My wife finds you profit much there, for you have recovered your skill in Cheddar cheese, and for a demonstration have sent us one of the best we have seen.

“I thank you for your care about my grandchild,¹ but, having wearied myself with consideration every way, I resolve to have him in my house. I long to speak with you about it.

“For news we have little. Only our government here are so truly zealous for the advancement of the protestant religion, as it is established in the church of England, that they are sending the Common Prayer-book the second time into Scotland.¹ No doubt but my Lord Lauderdale knows it will agree with their present constitution; but surely he was much mistaken when he administered the covenant to England.² But we shall see how the tripods and the holy altar will agree. My Lord of Ormond is

¹ Anthony Ashley, afterwards third Earl of Shaftesbury.

² A scornful reference to those tyrannical efforts to force the ecclesiastical system and the ritual of the church of England upon the Scotch presbyterians, which had driven them into insurrection in the previous summer; Lauderdale being now no less bloodthirsty as an episcopalian than he had been in the time of the Commonwealth as a presbyterian.

said to be dying. So that you have Irish and Scotch news; and for English, you make as much at Bristol as in any part of the kingdom.

“ Thus recommending you to the protection of the Bishop of Bath and Wells (whose strong beer is the only spiritual thing any Somersetshire gentleman knows), I rest,

“ Your affectionate and assured friend,

“ SHAFTESBURY.”¹

The other letter was written in the following August. Locke had been with Shaftesbury at Thanet House in April and May, 1680, and then had apparently gone down to St. Giles's with him for a few weeks. He thus wrote on the day after his return to London.

“ MY LORD,—Though Mr. Percival comes as well furnished with all the current news of the town as his, Mr. Hoskins's,² and my stock put together could amount to, yet your lordship will pardon me if I take the liberty to trouble you with one piece of news. I was told to-day by one who had it whispered to him as a very true and serious secret, viz., that my Lord Sunderland was to go Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, the Duke to retire thither, and that the white staff³ would very speedily be sent to your lordship, and that the Duchess of Portsmouth⁴ was soliciting it with all her endeavours.

“ This, though it be so extraordinary that it seems fit to be put amongst huntsmen's stories, and therefore I have desired Mr. Percival to give it to you as you are returning from the chase, yet it is apt to make one reflect upon what is very much believed, that there must be a parliament; and in preparation thereunto there is already great striving amongst those who think themselves most in danger who shall be thrown to the dogs. And who can think it other than good court-breeding that might become a duke or a duchess to strain courtesy in the case, and each desire to prefer the other as most deserving? This is agreed, that there is a great ferment

¹ Lord King, p. 36; Shaftesbury to Locke, 20 March, 1679-80.

² “Mr. Percival” and “Mr. Hoskins” were two members of Shaftesbury's “family.” The former was evidently the bearer of a letter from the latter, as well as this of Locke's, to St. Giles's.

³ The symbol of the secretaryship of state, then held by Sunderland.

⁴ Charles the Second's mistress, Madame de Querouaille.

working now at court, and 'tis not everybody knows who influences. Mr. Brisbane,¹ who is looked on as none of the most inconsiderable of men in employment, is newly turned out of his judge advocate's place, and nobody knows the hand that hurt him, though it were the commissioners of the admiralty that visibly gave him the blow.

"The Duke of Ormond, 'tis believed, will certainly be sent for over. 'Tis hard to conceive it shall be to make way for my Lord of Essex, though he be a man of known merit, and harder that it should be to succeed to the care of Aldersgate upon occasion. 'Tis certain his son's² ravings in his fever plainly showed how full his head was with Tangier, and many conclude that sunk him to his grave. But who knows the secrets of fate? Your lordship has seen many a lusty undertaker go before you. My Lord Latimer,³ 'tis reported, has his bedchamberman's place, as my Lord Lumley that of the Earl of Rochester, whose penitential confessions, I am told, are speedily to be published by Dr. Burnet,⁴ who was with him till a little before his death.

"If what his Majesty is reported to have said to the Lord Mayor yesterday, when he presented the Common Hall petition to him, be true, 'tis probable that Whitehall is as little dissatisfied as the city overjoyed with Bethel's choice,⁵ for 'tis the talk that his Majesty said that he hoped he might prove (as several others who had been represented to him as enemies) a very good servant, and particularly named Lawson,⁶ as one who served him faithfully and died in his service. But what expectation he has already raised of himself Mr. Percival will be able to inform your lordship at large.

"My Lord Russell I found not at home when I went to wait on him to-day from your lordship. My lady was well, and very glad to hear that your lordship and my lady were so.

¹ Locke's friend, formerly the secretary of legation at Paris, now, or till now, holding a more important position in London.

² The Earl of Ossory, son of the Duke of Ormond, who died a few days before, while on his way to undertake the vain enterprise of saving Tangier from the Moors.

³ The Earl of Danby's eldest son.

⁴ The famous bishop of Salisbury of William the Third's reign.

⁵ That is, with the triumph, after an angry and famous battle, of Slingsby Bethel, one of the whig candidates for the shrievalty of London.

⁶ Admiral Sir John Lawson, killed in 1665, during the first Dutch war.

“ My Lady Northumberland goes not into France.

“ I have not had the opportunity this one day that I have been in town to go and wait on Mr. Anthony. But Mr. Tanner, who was here this morning, assured me he was perfectly well.

“ I met many of your lordship’s friends to-day, who have asked me when you will be in town again, with an earnestness as if they wanted you already.

“ I pray God preserve your lordship in health and safety, and am, my lord, your lordship’s most humble and most obedient servant,

“ J. LOCKE.”¹

If Locke had often to do such a hard day’s work in seeing Lord Shaftesbury’s friends and collecting gossip for him as that letter implies, he must certainly have had his hands full.

But this was a busy time for politicians, and Shaftesbury could not long remain in Dorsetshire, even with such an active representative in London as Locke. After a comparative lull of several months a new stir was rising in the political world.

Charles the Second had been living for some time on French bribes ; but the French bribes were not sufficient for his needs, and, much as he dreaded a meeting of parliament—dreading it all the more because the people were clamouring so eagerly for it—he now found it necessary to use the only way open to him for endeavouring to obtain fresh supplies. The parliament which last met in May, 1679, having been dissolved in the following July, a new parliament, which had been shortly afterwards elected, was accordingly convened for the first time on the 21st of October, 1680. The king made urgent request for a grant of money to help him in saving Tangier from

¹ Christie, vol. ii., pp. 367—369 ; Locke to Shaftesbury, 5 August [1680]. I am obliged to Mr. George Hancock, in whose possession it is, for a transcript of this letter, slightly correcting Mr. Christie’s text.

the Moors. But the commons were resolved first to endeavour to save England from the catholics. The last year's debates about popish plots and the exclusion of the Duke of York were immediately revived and repeated with fresh energy. The old exclusion bill was passed through the lower house by the 11th of November, but rejected by the house of lords on being brought before it on the 15th. A famous war of words was on that occasion waged between Shaftesbury and Halifax, and the eloquence and personal influence of Halifax turned the scale; he, however, opposing the bill, not in the interests of the Duke of York, but because he feared that if Shaftesbury were successful, he would also, considering the temper of the country just then, succeed in securing the recognition of the Duke of Monmouth as heir to the crown. The ill-advised action of Halifax and all the trimmers, in too eager support of the Prince of Orange's cause, left the succession to the Duke of York.

Locke was in Oxford when parliament opened, but, apparently at Shaftesbury's summons, he came up to London a few days before the great debate of the 15th of November, and he was at hand to advise the earl, during the next five or six weeks, on the business that then engaged the attention but divided the interests of the anti-catholics, Shaftesbury becoming more than ever the champion of Monmouth, and Halifax and his friends more than ever the supporters of William of Orange. There was little but wasted eloquence and wasted energy in the business, however, and of Locke's share in it on this occasion, as in the earlier turmoil of the previous year, we have no record. Locke was in London until the 28th of December,¹ at any rate; but he probably left it before

¹ On which day he noted down some curious corrections, supplied by

the 10th of January, when the king unexpectedly prorogued parliament, on finding that instead of granting him the supplies he needed, the commons were preparing to render it illegal for him to obtain money in any other way.

The constitutional struggle, threatening every day to break out into civil war, was only restrained for a little while. The prorogued parliament was dissolved on the 18th of January, and a new parliament summoned to meet at Oxford on the 21st of March, 1680-1. The prorogation gave great offence, the dissolution greater, the choice of Oxford as the next meeting-place most of all. The Earl of Essex and fifteen other peers vainly expostulated with the king. Shaftesbury was one of those fifteen, and he further did all in his power to inform the electors throughout the country of the dangerous aspect of affairs, and to urge upon them the extreme importance of choosing representatives who could be trusted to stand out boldly, not only for the exclusion bill, but also for a readjustment of the royal prerogative as regarded the calling, proroguing, and dissolving of parliament. He also, understanding that the king intended to go to Oxford with a substantial military guard, took a part, if not a leading part, in arranging that the members of parliament should likewise be attended by a sufficient number of armed servants to protect them from treachery in case of need.¹

Whatever may have been the services rendered by Locke in the more important preparations for that ex-

Shaftesbury to Rushworth's 'Collection,' which had lately been published. (Lord King, pp. 118, 119.) I have not in this section generally cited my authorities for Locke's personal movements, as these will be described more fully in the next section.

¹ Christie, vol. ii., p. 401, and Appendix, p. cxi.

pected crisis, we have minute details of his share in borrowing from his old teacher, Dr. John Wallis, the great mathematician, a portion of his house at Oxford for Shaftesbury's use during the extraordinary meeting of parliament;¹ and, occupying his own quarters at Christ Church, it is evident that he was a constant attendant and a very close observer at its very short session. Of its earlier proceedings he wrote a more complete account than is to be found elsewhere.² But there was little to be said about it. Charles the Second had used the interval in effecting a fresh arrangement, by which he was to receive from the French king a pension during the next three years, and he was thus able to dispense with any grant of money from the commons. Accordingly, finding that the temper of the new parliament was even more stubborn than that of the last, he dissolved it on the 28th of March, after it had been in actual session only five days. No other parliament met during his reign.

The fears of Shaftesbury and his friends that a civil war might break out at Oxford were not realised; but serious trouble to Shaftesbury ensued. On the 2nd of July he was arrested on a trumped-up charge of treasonable designs against the government, and lodged in the Tower, where he was detained without trial until the 24th of November. But in spite of the oaths of many witnesses, and of the virulent satire of 'Absalom and Achitophel,' which was published in the week before the trial with the special object of influencing the verdict, he was acquitted by the grand jury, and released, though only on bail, on

¹ Christie, vol. ii., pp. 392—401; Locke to Shaftesbury, 6 Feb., 1680-1; Shaftesbury to Locke, 8 Feb., 19 Feb. and 22 Feb., 1680-1.

² *Ibid.*, vol. ii., Appendix, pp. cxii.—cxv.; Locke to Stringer, 26 March, 1681.

the 1st of December, the bail being discharged on the following 13th of February.

Locke was in London during the weeks before and for some time after Shaftesbury's arrest; but we have no details concerning their relations at this time. And so much as has to be said as to their subsequent relations, in respect of politics, will find its place on a later page.¹

Their relations apart from politics must not be lost sight of, however; and something must here be said about one very important service that Locke was rendering to his friend during these years.

In tracing his early connection with Shaftesbury's family, we have seen how, besides superintending the later education of the youth who was ultimately to become the second Earl of Shaftesbury, Locke found a wife for him, and assisted at the birth of his eldest son in February, 1670-1. The intimate relations that then existed between Locke and this Lord Ashley and his wife do not appear to have been maintained after 1672 or 1673. Whatever may have been the merits of the Lady Dorothy concerning whom Locke and others thought so well, the merits of the husband were few, and Lord Shaftesbury probably acted very wisely in persuading his son to assign to him, as he did in March, 1673-4, the formal guardianship of the eldest child, then three years old.² There can be no doubt at all as to his wisdom in making full use of Locke's help in arranging for the proper bringing-up of the heir

¹ I fear that the foregoing paragraphs will be unsatisfactory to my readers; but I have felt it necessary to give, in the briefest possible epitome, so much of the contemporary political history as Locke was evidently connected with, without going out of my proper province to narrate incidents through the details of which I cannot follow him.

² *Shaftesbury Papers*, series v., no. 2.

whom he designed to be a worthy representative of the family name.

Little Anthony Ashley being so young, Locke at first naturally did his work chiefly by proxy. He appears to have had some previous acquaintance with a schoolmaster named Birch, who had educated his daughter Elizabeth so well that, besides other and perhaps greater attractions, she was a fluent talker in both Greek and Latin; and on his recommendation Mrs. Elizabeth Birch was made governess of the child. "I desire that Mr. Birch send his daughter upon any terms," Shaftesbury wrote to Locke in 1674. "I will take care we shall not differ upon anything that is reason."¹ Mrs. Birch seems to have done her work well, under the careful oversight, while Locke was in France, of Lord Shaftesbury himself. "My Lord Ashley and his family are going from St. Giles's," Stringer said in one letter to him; "only Mr. Anthony is to remain with his grandfather by agreement, and to be educated by him."² It has already been noted that in 1677 Shaftesbury commissioned Locke, then in Paris, to procure the best French and Latin school-books for "Mr. Anthony," who was now learning to prattle in Greek as easily as in his mother-tongue. As soon as Locke came back to England, the direct superintendence of the child's education, in body as well as in mind, was again entrusted to him, and, though he evidently did little in the way of actual teaching, he appears to have been a very careful superintendent. Writing to Shaftesbury in August, 1680, on his return to London after a fortnight's absence, he thought it necessary to apologise for allowing even a day to pass without personally looking

¹ Christie, vol. ii., p. 61; Shaftesbury to Locke, 23 Nov., 1674.

² *Ibid.*, vol. ii., p. 223; Stringer to Locke, 5 June, 1676.

after his charge, at that time established in a separate home at Clapham, under Mrs. Birch's management. "I have not had the opportunity, this one day that I have been in town," he said, in a letter lately quoted, "to go and wait on Mr. Anthony."¹

"Mr. Anthony," when he was in his thirty-fifth year, being perhaps disposed to somewhat exaggerate the connection of his family with the great man who had lately died, attributed to Locke the care, not only of himself, but of all his brothers and sisters. "In our education," he said, "Mr. Locke governed according to his own principles, since published by him, and with such success that we all of us came to full years with strong and healthy constitutions—my own the worst, though never faulty till of late. I was his more peculiar charge, being, as eldest son, taken by my grandfather and bred under his immediate care, Mr. Locke having the absolute direction of my education, and to whom, next my immediate parents, as I must own the greatest obligation, so I have ever preserved the highest gratitude and duty."² There is nothing to show that Locke had to do with any but the eldest of Shaftesbury's grandchildren, or with him, in the capacity of tutor, after he was about twelve years old; but it is clear that he had much to do with him in that way between 1679 and 1683. We shall hereafter see something of the "principles since published by him," on which the youth said that his education was governed.

About Locke's more private concerns and pursuits, and

¹ Christie, vol. ii., p. 369; Locke to Shaftesbury, 5 Aug., 1680.

² MSS. in the Remonstrants' Library; cited in *Notes and Queries*, vol. iii., p. 98.

the temper in which he engaged in them, during the four years following his return from France, we have somewhat fuller information than about his public employments and his personal relations with the statesman who still used him as his chief counsellor.

Taking up his residence at Thanet House on the 30th of April, 1679, he at once found plenty to do, in addition to his attendance on Lord Shaftesbury's affairs, in settling various business matters of his own, and in visiting his old friends. We find him at once renewing acquaintance with the Countess of Northumberland, then living, with her second husband, Ralph Montague, at Montague House, on the site now occupied by the British Museum; with Thomas Herbert, his sometime companion at Montpellier, and soon to become Earl of Pembroke; with Sydenham, Mapletoft, Thomas, Tyrrell, Boyle, and many others. To some of these friends, and to the sights of London, he had to introduce the young Danish astronomer; Olaus Römer, whom he had begun to know in Paris, and who had either accompanied or immediately followed him to London.¹ In June he spent a fortnight at Bexwells,

¹ *Additional MSS.*, no. 15642; Locke's journal for 1679. It may have been for Römer's benefit that Locke made some curious notes entitled by him, "England, 1679;" from which the following passages are extracted:—"The sports of England, which, perhaps, a curious stranger would be glad to see, are horse-racing, hawking, and hunting. At Marylebone and Putney he may see several persons of quality bowling two or three times a week all the summer; wrestling in Lincoln's Inne Field every evening all the summer; bear and bull-baiting, and sometime prizes, at the Bear-Garden; shooting in the long-bow and stob-ball, in Tothill Fields; cudgel-playing in several places in the country; and hurling in Cornwall. See the East India House and their magazines; the Custom House; the Thames, by water, from London Bridge to Deptford; and the King's yard at Deptford; the sawing windmill; Tradescant's garden and closet; Sir James Morland's closet and water-works; the iron mills at Wandsworth, four miles above London, upon

an Essex village, twenty-five miles from London, where Thomas Stringer, Shaftesbury's secretary, had a house which his wife generally occupied, and where he himself took holidays as often as he could.¹

Having retired into the country, Locke wrote thence to the Thames, or rather those in Sussex; Paradise by Hatton Garden; the glass-house at the Savoy and at Vauxhall. Eat fish in Fish Street, especially lobsters, Colchester oysters, and a fresh cod's-head. The veal and beef are excellent good in London; the mutton better in several counties in England. A venison pasty and a chine of beef are good everywhere, and so are crammed capons and fat chickens. Rails and heath-polts, ruffs, and reeves are excellent meat wherever they can be met with. Puddings of several sorts, and creams of several fashions, both excellent, but they are seldom to be found, at least in their perfection, at common eating houses. Mango and saio are two sorts of sauces brought from the East Indies. Bermuda oranges and potatoes, both exceeding good in their kind. Cheddar and Cheshire cheese. Home-made drinks of England are beer and ale, strong and small; those of most note that are to be sold are Lambeth ale, Margate ale, and Derby ale; Herefordshire cider, perry, mede. There are also several sorts of compounded ales, as cock ale, wormwood ale, lemon ale, scurvygrass ale, College ale, etc. These are to be had at Hercules Pillars, near the Temple; at the Trumpet and other houses in Sheer Lane, Bell Alley; and, as I remember, at the English Tavern near Charing Cross. Foreign drinks to be found in England are all sorts of Spanish, Greek, Italian, Rhenish, and other wines, which are to be got up and down at several taverns. Coffee, tea, and chocolate, at coffee-houses. Mum at the mum houses and other places; and Molly, a drink of Barbados, by chance at some Barbados merchants. Punch, a compounded drink, on board some West India ships; and Turkish sherbert amongst the merchants. Manufactories of cloth, that will keep out rain; flannel, knives, locks and keys; scabbards for swords; several things wrought in steel, as little boxes, heads for canes, boots, riding-whips, Rippon spurs, saddles, etc. At Nottingham dwells a man who makes fans, hatbands, necklaces, and other things of glass, drawn out into very small threads."—Lord King, pp. 133—136.

¹ "My wife is settled at Bexwells," Stringer had written to Locke in February, 1675-6, "and hath the happiness of entertaining me there once a week."—Christie, vol. ii., p. 226.

Thoynard, the friend whom he had found and left in Paris, "I am able to communicate with you more at leisure and to say some things that the bustle in which I found myself while in London caused me to neglect when Mr. Römer went away; at parting from whom I was much upset." Locke had evidently forwarded by Römer an earlier letter which is now missing. In this one he communicated to Thoynard a good deal of scientific gossip, and told him, among other things, that Boyle was willing to lend him a translation of the Talmud, if a copy could not be procured in Paris. "I had not time," he continued, "to visit the Royal Society; so I can say nothing of what is going on among our *virtuosi*. In a little while I hope I may be able to reconcile myself with the muses. But, if the wickedness of our Europeans will not leave even one so manly and so honest as you are at peace, I am quite ready to go with you to the Ile de Bourbon; or if, without crossing the line and settling down at the antipodes, you will be content to separate yourself from the wicked world by crossing the great ocean which tempted the ambition and avarice of our forefathers, I shall be yet more ready to accompany you to Carolina, where there is a very fine island which they have done me the honour to name after me. There you can be emperor, for I can answer for it, that everything which bears the name of Locke is certain to obey you."¹

There is something more than playful courtesy in those

¹ *Additional MSS.*, no. 28836; Locke to Thoynard, 6 June, 1679. The reader will remember that in the extracts from Locke's letters to Thoynard and other foreign correspondents that will be given in this chapter and throughout the next volume, I am translating from the originals in French and Latin, and that, without attempting to imitate Locke's English phraseology, or always to translate quite literally, I endeavour only to reproduce their spirit, and to give accurately the statements contained in them.

sentences and in similar passages of later letters that will be quoted in their order. We must assume that, while together in Paris, Locke and Thoynard had often discussed the ugly condition of public affairs and the deplorable social abuses that were their concomitants. Both men, while anxious to make the best of their surroundings, to gather up all the information and instruction within their reach, to perfect their own minds and hearts and to benefit the world as much as they could by living prudent lives and imparting to others any useful knowledge that they possessed, seem often to have been very weary of it all. The wholesome pleasures of life they felt it to be as much a duty to indulge in as its sober pursuits and serious studies; but the public and private vice and heedlessness of any good and honest purpose in existence which prevailed—the coarseness and depravity, individual and national, that were nobly satirised by Molière, somewhat ignobly sneered at by Molière's English imitators, Wycherley and Congreve, half-approvingly laughed at by Dryden, and gloried in by such playwrights as Aphra Behn—were altogether hateful to them. Locke, at any rate, genial and generous as he was—all the more because of his geniality and generosity, his eager desire to see the world happier and wiser, and if he could to do something towards bettering its poor estate—was often filled with despair. Now especially that he had come back to England and saw court vices rampant everywhere, in politics nothing dominant but fraud and treachery, in society lewdness and profanity supreme, he was sorely tempted—his own indifferent health naturally conducing thereto—to throw up the game; and over and over again he said in effect to the few friends whose worth he knew, and who more or less shared his despondency, “ Let us go

right away from this loathsome state of things, let us part ourselves by broad oceans from the *méchants gens*, let us see whether we cannot find peace for ourselves, if not rescue for others, in some far off Atlantis or Utopia, where we can live happily and work out our theories of social progress and wellbeing.”¹

He could sneer, too, when the humour took him, and use bitter, mocking words about some of the customs that offended him in the frivolous, corrupted, polygynous, and polyandrous society by which he was surrounded. In that same letter he urged Thoynard to hasten a visit to England which was often talked of, in order that they might discuss in detail their projected flight from the modern Babylons, as well as other matters. “Among other reasons for which I want you to come over is this: I have found a beautiful girl to be your wife. Do not fear. Men are much better off here than in Ethiopia. If she does not suit you after some trial, you can sell her, and I think at a much higher price than a man who took his wife up to London last week, where he disposed of her at the rate of twopence a pound. I think yours would bring you in five or six shillings a pound, for she is handsome, young, very tender, and in good condition for the market. I pray you bring with you M. St. Colombe, who, I think, would gladly go a long way to see you married, and farther still to see you sell your wife at so much a pound—just as I have seen them sell pigs at Montpellier.”

Being at Bexwells from the 4th till the 18th of June,

¹ Scattered through his journal are many curious entries, headed ‘Atlantis,’ containing various notes concerning an ideal state of society; but they are so crude and fragmentary that I do not feel justified, by publishing them, in exposing them to the risk of being regarded as his fixed opinions and final deliberations.

Locke spent the next two months at Thanet House. Thence, in July, he wrote another letter to Thoynard, and its opening sentence implies that he had been very busy in the interval. "I have found, by good fortune," he said, "a little time in which to reply to your letters." He then proceeded to acknowledge the receipt of some books which his friend, who had been in his native town of Orleans, had bought for him, and to inform him of some return purchases that he had made, including a map and three books on shorthand writing. "I should have sent them to you before now, if I had not feared that they would not find you in Paris; but I see clearly that the walls of Paris are a sorcerer's circle, which you know not how to avoid. Yet I can tell you, for your excuse, that I should be glad enough to join you there."

He was more anxious, however, that his friend should come to London; and, after reference to another subject, he recurred, in a more jocular way than before, to the special reason that he had adduced for it in his former letter. Thoynard's parcel of books had been conveyed by the wife of John Brisbane, the English secretary of legation in Paris, where, as we have seen, Locke had made his acquaintance. "You seek so many occasions, at all cost, to confer benefits upon me," Locke now wrote, "that I am as grateful as I can be to a man who is resolved not to cross the Straits of Dover for my sake. But, as for that, it surprises me that you, who are such a man of the world, would not consent to escort hither a lady whose husband invited you to take charge of her, nor would even be tempted by the marketable lady whom I offered to you. But I fear I have exhausted all my arguments to persuade you to visit London, and this resolution of yours against such a proposal as that has forced me to abandon an

intention I had to prepare for you an elegant English speech with which to address the lady, as I feared you would not know enough of our language to make your own compliments in it; but now the speech is no more begotten than are the children of your intended wife.”¹

Locke wrote again to Thoynard a month later, and the forced gaiety of this letter, as of the former one, mixed up with correspondence about books and the like, ill concealed the dejection of the writer. After alluding to his friend's continued residence in Paris, he said, “Experience shows me that great towns are bewitched places which one cannot leave without great difficulty. I did not expect to remain in London more than twenty days after my return from France, and here I am still at the end of nearly four months. During the last fortnight I have had two horses in town, which have done me no other service than exercise their teeth. As that is not much use, I wish that Messieurs les Cartésiens,” who earned much ridicule by their theory that animals are automata, “would invent some machines of such a sort that one could mount them when one wished, without wasting hay and oats when they are idle. But these philosophers are always talking about machines, and never produce anything that is useful.”²

The fact that he owned two horses would justify the inference, if it were not clear in other ways, that Locke was now in tolerably comfortable circumstances, or at any rate that his evident depression of spirits at this time was not due to lack of money. Before he left England in 1675 he had invested what were, for those times, considerable amounts in mortgages and other securities. To

¹ *Additional MSS.*, no. 28728; Locke to Thoynard, 15 July, 1679.

² *Ibid.*, no. 28753; Locke to Thoynard, 15 August, 1679.

a Lady Windham he had lent 600*l.*, at six per cent. interest, on the security of some title deeds. With Mr. Percival, the banker, doubtless a kinsman of the Mrs. Mary Percival who was in attendance on Lady Shaftesbury, he had deposited money from time to time; and on the 10th of October, 1679, he drew from him in one sum 448*l.* 12*s.* 9*d.*, while in the previous May he had received 100*l.* which he had some years before advanced to a Mr. Jones to employ in "the raw silk trade."¹ In what new ways he invested these amounts, or what was the entire value of his property, we are not told; but it is evident that from the interest upon it, added to Lord Shaftesbury's annuity of 100*l.*, and his allowance as a student of Christ Church, he derived an income that cannot have been less than 200*l.* a year, and may have been considerably above that amount, besides all that he earned by new work.

From the journal that furnishes the grounds for that inference, may here be selected a few entries relating to small pecuniary and other transactions which throw certain little gleams of light on Locke's life and relations during this summer time.

On the 1st of May, the day after his arrival in London, we find him borrowing 1*l.* from Mrs. Elizabeth Birch, Anthony Ashley's governess; and dated the 23rd of June is this entry, "Paid Mrs. Elizabeth Birch, 6*s.* 2*d.* to even reckonings with her upon receipt of her bill, whereby I was debtor to her 9*l.* 6*s.* 2*d.*" Perhaps Mrs. Birch helped him in looking after some of those minor concerns which a bachelor is glad to relegate to a lady, if he can find one willing to help him thus. On the 5th of May he entered in his journal, "Mr. Stringer, credit by two guineas."

¹ *Additional MSS.*, no. 15642.

On the 30th, "Mr. Herbert paid me 12*l.*" On the 31st, "Left with the porter at Montague House, 'Optatus' and 'Facundus' to be delivered to Mrs. Beavis for Mr. Blomer, for which I paid at Paris ten livres." On the 3rd of June, "Mrs. Anne Beavis restored me my silver standish and candlesticks." On the 5th, "Left with Dr. Mapletoft a little red trunk, etc." On the 28th, "Repaid Dr. Mapletoft 4*s.* 4*d.*, it being in return of what he had overpaid me for the books I bought for him in France." On the 2nd of July, "Paid Mrs. Mary Percival 30*s.*, which she paid Nurse Tunstone for me, and 1*s.* 6*d.* for a drum she bought for me for little T. S." "Little T. S." was doubtless the small son of Thomas Stringer, Shaftesbury's secretary and Locke's friend. On the 8th, "Lent Thomas Herbert, Esq., 5*s.*" On the 12th, "Dr. Blomer paid me 15*s.* 6*d.* for 'Optatus' and 'Facundus.' Mrs. Beavis paid me 7*s.* 9*d.* for the steel box I bought for my Lady Northumberland. Found at Thanet House the things I left with Mr. Stringer at Exeter House, on the 12th of November, 1675, except my picture which he had removed to his house at Bexwells." On the 16th, "Sent my serge suit to Mr. Hicks's to be kept there. Lent Dr. Daniel Cox Dandini's 'Voiage of Mont Liban' and Dubois's 'Voiage of Madagascar.' Bought two weather-glasses at 15*s.* a piece." On the 21st, "Bought for the Earl of Shaftesbury, Usher's 'Answer to the Jesuits' Challenge,' and his 'Discourse of the Religion anciently professed by the Irish and British,' 5*s.*" On the 29th, "Lent Sir Peter Colleton Figueras's 'Voiage en Perse.'" On the 30th, "Lent Mr. Boyle *Journal des Savants.*" On the 1st of August, "For a ream of paper for Dr. Thomas, 7*s.*" On the 10th, "Lent Mr. James Tyrrell Dandini's 'Voyage to Mont Liban' and Piraud's

‘Travels.’” On the 16th, “Paid for Cowley’s ‘Poems,’ 13s. 6d.; for a hone, 12s. 6d.” Four months later, on the 17th of December, Locke made out a curious little list of small expenses incurred by him:—“For a barber’s pot, 3s.; a cravat, 10d.; grinding a razor and penknife, 4d.; two cravats, 2s. 3d.; a link, 1½d.; grinding two razors, 4d.; three holland caps, 4s.; a muslin cravat, 4s. 6d.; three vizard masks, 14s.; apples, 2s.; playthings for little Stringer, 3s.”¹

Special interest attaches to two entries of earlier dates. One, dated the 28th of June, “Received of John Anthony, by the hands of my cousin, John Keene, 10l.,” shows that he still maintained connection with his Somersetshire kinsfolk, this John Keene being the second son of the Edmund Keene whose sister his father had married, and who had married his father’s sister. From the other entry it would appear that the younger Keene was now living in London. On the 9th of August, when Locke was preparing to go out of town, and the day before he complained to Thoynard that his two horses were eating their oats in idleness, he made this note: “Left at my cousin Keene’s a box of French books, bound in parchment, marked C. B., no. 2, and a box of large French books, marked J. L., no. 1, both sealed. Taken away my strong chest and all in it.” Under the same date there is this other note, “Left with Mr. Stringer the key of my closet at Thanet House.”²

Wherever Locke intended to go when he made those arrangements for leaving London on the 9th of August, his arrangements were interfered with by a summons to go down to his sick friend, Mr. Beavis, at Olantigh, a village in Kent, between Sittingbourne and Canterbury,

¹ *Additional MSS.*, no. 15642.

² *Ibid.*

where, as we shall see, he was for some time detained by his own illness. Going to Olantigh on the 18th of August, he did not return to Thanet House until the 3rd of October, and then he found a good deal of work awaiting him in connection with Lord Shaftesbury's political movements.

He had time, however, to concern himself about other matters. Immediately after his return, at Thoynard's request, he induced Boyle and the other members of the Royal Society who were interested in astronomy, to promise that, as soon as the weather was favourable, they would make some special observations of Jupiter and his satellites; and in reporting this to Thoynard, he added some remarks in the mocking humour that was at this period common to him. "What I fear is that Jupiter and his body-guard, alarmed at your designs, are hiding themselves from us, for, ever since, the heavens have been clouded over, and I suspect that Jupiter has ordered all his hosts to conceal themselves, lest they should become too well known to mortals; and, since even the sun has not dared to appear in these quarters, the sailors, peasants, and gardeners begin to grumble, and I meet none but rogues and ladies (who love the dark, and would have nothing more splendid than themselves be seen in the world) who are content with it. We must take care, then, that the *virtuosi* who cause this darkness do not bring persecution on themselves. You will see that I have reason to talk thus when you know that even at Oxford they not long ago treated as heretics all who understood Greek, and that Bacon was banished because he knew a little mathematics; yet these things were by no means so bold or monstrous as a resolution to spy out the secrets of the great king of heaven."¹

¹ *Additional MSS.*, no. 28753; Locke to Thoynard, 13 Oct., 1679.

Notwithstanding the bigotry of Oxford, Locke went thither as soon as he was able to leave London again. "Though he had found some advantage to his health by his travels into France," said Lady Masham, "yet it was not so established but that, after his return, he was still less able than formerly to continue long in London, without retreating now and then to some neighbouring village for a few days or weeks, to recover the prejudice his health received from the smoke of that vast quantity of sea-coal which is burnt in this great city."¹ From London he accordingly absented himself as often as he could, and constantly during the winter months.

Leaving London, apparently, in the middle of December, he went to Oxford, where his student's quarters had been unoccupied for at least four years and a half. On the 20th we find him in the university, borrowing 9s. from his friend James Tyrrell, and on the 27th paying 2*l.* 12s. for a new college gown²—a purchase that seems to imply that he thought of again taking up his residence at Christ Church. The visit that he now paid to it, however, cannot have lasted many weeks. Finding his health no better there, he went to spend two or three months with his friends in Somersetshire, sending thence, as we have seen, a present of a Cheddar cheese to Lady Shaftesbury, and from Pensford he returned to London for the summer. From London, towards the end of May, 1680, it would seem, he wrote to Dr. Fell, now bishop of Oxford, but still dean of Christ Church, apologising for his longer absence from the college than he had anticipated. "You are not to excuse your address by letter, as if it could give

¹ MSS. in the Remonstrants' Library; Lady Masham to Le Clerc, 12 Jan., 1704-5.

² Additional MSS., no. 15642.

a trouble to me," Fell wrote in reply. "I assure you I have that respect and friendship for you that I should have been glad to have heard from you, although you had no other business than to let me know you were in health, especially since you left this place in such a condition as might make your friends apprehensive for you."¹

There is not much of general interest in Locke's correspondence with Thoynard during this year. The letters chiefly treat of the literary and scientific matters in which the two friends were particularly interested. There are also in them numerous allusions to the medical studies with which Locke was still as busy as his other occupations would permit, and towards the extension of which he often used Thoynard as an agent for communicating with various French physicians. In some reference is made, in a way showing that his old intimacy with her was still maintained, to Mrs. Grigg, his cousin, whose husband had died ten years before, and who was now travelling on the continent as governess to some youth of good family, whose name does not transpire. "Mrs. Grigg," Locke said in one letter, "has written to me from Saumur to say she is infinitely obliged to you for your kindness and care on her behalf, not only at Paris and Orleans, but also on her journey."² "You cannot imagine," he wrote four weeks later, "what acknowledgments and thanks you have won by your goodness and good offices towards Mrs. Grigg. She speaks of it in all her letters to everybody. The father and mother of the little boy, too, have thanked me several times on your behalf." "I must not forget," we read in another letter, "that

¹ Lord King, p. 152; Fell to Locke, 1 June, 1680.

² *Additional MSS.*, no. 28728; Locke to Thoynard, 10 June, 1680.

³ *Ibid.*; Locke to Thoynard, 5 July, 1680.

Mrs. Grigg, from whom I heard yesterday, bids me say all I can in testimony of her thanks and regard for you. I cannot say it as prettily as she would; but I am no less obliged to you than she is for your kindness in this matter."¹

Between the spring of 1680 and the following December, Locke chiefly resided at Thanet House, but he was often away for short periods. He took a holiday in June,² and he was absent again during the last half of July, apparently going down to St. Giles's with Lord Shaftesbury, and paying a short visit to Dr. Thomas at Salisbury on his way home. In returning he passed through Basingstoke on the 2nd of August. "There being a visitation of bishops," he wrote in his journal on that day, "Mr. Carter, who found it a long time now to the next presentment, sat drinking with his churchwardens next chamber to me, and, after drink had well warmed them, a case of doctrine or discipline engaged them in a quarrel, which broke out in defiance and cuffs, and, about midnight, raised the house to keep the peace, but so fruitlessly that, between skirmishing, parleys, and loud defiances, the whole night was spent in noise and tumult, of which I had more than sleep. In the morning, when I rose, all was quiet, and the parson a-bed, where he is like to be kept past his ale and sleep, his gown having more of the honour of a tattered colours than a divinity robe."³

Though much in London at this time, Locke appears to have been always anxious to get out of it. During the autumn of 1680 he was repeatedly thwarted in his hopes of paying another visit to France, whither the Countess

¹ *Additional MSS.*, no. 28753; Locke to Thoynard, 5 Aug., 1680.

² *Ibid.*; Locke to Thoynard, 1 July, 1680.

³ Lord King, p. 133.

of Northumberland was intending to go, with him as her guest. "I hope to place myself in your hands in twenty days or thereabouts," he wrote to Thoynard early in August; "and, to tell you the truth, it is the hope of seeing and embracing you again which makes me take this journey."¹ But a few hours after writing that he learned that Lady Northumberland had abandoned or postponed her projected journey;² and his next letter to Thoynard shows his disappointment thereat and his dissatisfaction with nearly everything around him. "Fortune continues to thwart all my plans, as she has constantly done ever since my return to England," he said; "so much so that I have ceased to expect that I can dispose of myself as I wish, and that I always find myself where I never thought of being."³ Had Locke lived all these forty-eight years, and only now made that discovery?

Hindered from going so far as Paris, he was able to spend the first week or so of September at Alsford in Kent; and a month later he was at Oxford.⁴ But in the interval and afterwards he was very busy at Thanet House, helping Shaftesbury at this time partly as a doctor as well as in political affairs. "I had many other things to write about," he said in abrupt ending of a letter to Thoynard, "but people come in and interrupt me, and the post is just going out, and I wish a thousand times that I could go with it to Paris."⁶

¹ *Additional MSS.*, no. 28753; Locke to Thoynard, 5 Aug., 1680.

² Christie, vol. ii., p. 369; Locke to Shaftesbury, 5 Aug. [1680]. This letter was quoted in the last section.

³ *Additional MSS.*, no. 28728; Locke to Thoynard, 30 Aug., 1680.

⁴ *Ibid.*, no. 28753; Locke to Thoynard, 3 Sept., 1680.

⁵ *Ibid.*, no. 28728; Locke to Thoynard, 25 Oct., 1680.

⁶ *Ibid.*, no. 28728; Locke to Thoynard, 16 Sept., 1680.

In November he again expected to visit France,¹ but he was again disappointed. He failed also in endeavouring to persuade Thoynard to visit him in England. "Yesterday," he wrote in December, "I dined with Mr. Brisbane. We drank your health from our hearts, and wished very much that you were of the party. There is nothing in the world I desire more eagerly than to see you here, and pass some time with you in London; and if after that you are dissatisfied with this part of the globe, we can go together to the Ile de Bourbon or Carolina."²

The letter last quoted from was written on a large sheet of paper, with a broad margin. "You may perhaps wonder," Locke said in it, "what whim has made me put a margin to my letter. I tell you frankly, it is in order that I may ask you to put margins to all your letters to me, and to write them on large paper like this. I value your letters more than those of any other friends, and consult them so often that the little sheets on which you have been in the habit of writing them run the risk of being lost, and I am much troubled, when I want to refer to them again, if I find that this has happened." The next sentence may be quoted in the original, as an amusing instance of the way in which Locke mixed up his French and his Latin. "Mais j'ai intention de mettre les sommaires à la marge, si vous m'accorderai cette grace, parceque vous ne devez pas regarder vos lettres que vous me faites l'honneur de m'écrire ut vulgus epistolarum quæ vocis sunt vicaria eodemque momento intelliguntur pereunt, sed inter concilia servandus ut amicitiae literaturae, ingeniique tua munimenta, et absentiae solatium."

¹ *Additional MSS.*, no. 28728., Locke to Thoynard, 15 Nov., 1680.

² *Ibid.*, no. 28753; Locke to Thoynard, 13 Dec., 1680.

Detained too far into the winter by Lord Shaftesbury's business, Locke appears early in January, 1680-1, to have gone to Oakley, near Shotover, in Buckinghamshire, where his friend James Tyrrell lived. He was lying ill there when Shaftesbury requested him to find lodgings for him to occupy at Oxford during the meeting of parliament. He received the letter on a Tuesday. "I was very much troubled I could not go about it the very moment I received your lordship's commands," he wrote on the following Sunday from Oxford, "and I thank God that the slow haste I made hath not had such effects as the friends where I was feared." "Wednesday," he said, "I made use of, by quitting my bed and my chamber, to fit myself the best I could to bear the cold open air, and the next day following I removed hither. I wrapped myself very warm, and galloped most part of the way, and, I thank God, have found no great increase of my cough since."¹

That he was none the worse for the journey, either in health or in spirits, would appear from a long letter which he wrote at this time to Thoynard, treating of clocks and other contrivances, illustrated with diagrams of his own preparing, and, among other things, referring to the death of an elephant which Thoynard had described to him. "There is reason to believe," wrote Locke, "that beasts are wiser than men; for, as one of our burlesque poets has said,—

“ ‘For beasts with beasts
Fight not for th' worship of us men,
Though we have done as much for them.
Th' Egyptians worshipp'd dogs, and for
Their faith made fierce and zealous war;

¹ Christie, vol. ii., p. 392; Locke to Shaftesbury, 6 Feb., 1680-1.

Others ador'd a rat, and some
 For that church suffer'd martyrdom ;
 The Indians fought for the truth
 Of th' elephant and monkey's tooth ;
 But no beast ever was so slight
 For man, as for his god, to fight.
 They have more wit, alas ! and know
 Themselves and us better than so.' " ¹

“If M. Römer has given you, as he promised, the longitudes of Bayonne and Cordova, in relation to Paris, you will add much to my treasures by sending them to me,” was one sentence—illustrative of Locke’s habit of acquiring information of all sorts—in his next letter to Thoynard. Nearly all his correspondence with this friend is crowded with questions and answers, messages and replies, about mechanical inventions and the like. “The parliament will meet here soon,” Locke added in this letter, “and then I hope to find some one among my friends who can give the measures of the stoppers. In

¹ *Additional MSS.*, no. 28753; Locke to Thoynard, 9 Feb., 1680-1. The quotation is from ‘Hudibras,’ part i., canto i., ll. 771—784; it does not, however, as regards the first, second, and fifth lines, agree with Butler’s published text.

“They say the elephant is the wisest of beasts,” Locke said in his next letter, dated the 20th of February; “and this one well confirms the opinion, having lived sixteen or seventeen years at court without their being able to discover its sex. If they could find a pineal gland proportioned to its body, ought not *Messieurs les Cartésiens* to say that it is a beast with a great soul? But I would not that they should give to elephants paper and ink, if it be true that they can write, lest they should inform posterity by their memoirs that it is we men who are only machines, and that they alone possess understanding. If you have translated the burlesque verses in my last, you will admit that they have good grounds for writing thus in their philosophical treatises.” Locke was fond of ridiculing the opinions of the Cartesians, and not unwilling, as in this case, to ridicule other absurdities as well.

the poor state of health in which I was while I was in London, I could not inform myself as I wished about the winding machine. I see well by the interest you take in my health, and by the interpretation you put on my silence, that your friendship always inclines you in my favour, and that you can make allowance for all my infirmities.”¹

“You make me cherish my health by the interest you take in it,” Locke said to Thoynard in another letter from Oxford, “for there is nothing makes me value my life so much as your friendship. I must not, therefore, speak of St. Helena, or the Ile de Bourbon, or Carolina, if you do not mean to go with me to any of those places. Find only some healthy, quiet spot, where I can enjoy your conversation, and you will at any moment find me ready to follow you to that earthly paradise.”²

This project of going out of Europe in quest of an Atlantis elsewhere may never have been seriously entertained, but the frequent references to it help to show us very plainly how ill at ease Locke was in the corrupted and degraded England in which he found himself constrained to live.

He was still hoping, though in vain, that Thoynard would at any rate visit him in England, if only to go back to France, instead of wandering with him into unknown regions. “I am altogether charmed,” he wrote in April, 1681, “with the prospect of seeing you *au pays d’outre mer*, as you say. Let me know at once the time when you think of coming to England, and I shall not fail to be in London, ready to receive you as soon as you arrive, so as not to lose a moment of your company.”³

¹ *Additional MSS.*, no. 28753; Locke to Thoynard, 20 Feb., 1680-1.

² *Ibid.*; Locke to Thoynard, 1 April, 1681.

³ *Ibid.*

“Mr. Brisbane and I supped by ourselves the other evening,” he wrote from London in June, “where we drank your health, and could wish for nothing else but your presence to make us the happiest of men; and, to tell you the truth, I have never been more restless than since you raised in me the hope of seeing and embracing you here. Hasten, I do beg of you, those affairs at Orleans which have detained you so long, and give me the opportunity of making some return for the great obligations that I owe you for the most delightful friendship of my whole life.”¹

If the reiterated expressions of regard for his friend which Locke indulged in—and of which only a very few specimens are being here given—seem redundant, let it be remembered that they are partly characteristic of the time, and yet more characteristic of the man himself. There was a gushing fountain of tenderness in Locke’s nature, which, as he had neither wife, nor child, nor sister, he poured out upon the friends whom he loved. We may smile at this if we like. It is not common to men of the world. It is not one of the ordinary marks of a philosopher. But Locke had it, and perhaps, both as a philosopher and as a man of the world, he was enriched by the possession.

Very few letters written by him to Thoynard for some long time after the one last quoted from have been preserved, and we are not able very clearly to follow his movements through the last two years of his residence at this time in England. Having gone from Oakley to Oxford, at Shaftesbury’s request, at the beginning of February, 1680-1, and stayed there till after the meeting of the six days’ parliament in March, he appears to have

¹ *Additional MSS.*, no. 28728; Locke to Thoynard, 13 June, 1681.

stayed on till the end of May. "The driest spring that hath been known," he recorded of this season, "there having been no rain from the end of March to the end of June."¹ This dry weather seems to have been favourable to his health during the spring and summer of 1681, and it was also to the advantage of his health that he was not then much in London. He was in town in the middle of June, and he was probably at Thanet House on the 2nd of July, when Shaftesbury was arrested; but while Shaftesbury was in the Tower, he would not be allowed to have access to him, and there was therefore no reason for his remaining in London. He went thither from Oxford, towards the end of August, and he was doubtless with Shaftesbury during his trial and acquittal in November. But he appears to have been in Oxford or the neighbourhood during most of this year and the following year and a-half.

Though Locke had returned to England especially to assist Lord Shaftesbury in political affairs, and though much of the time that he could spare from those affairs and from miscellaneous studies and occupations was spent in superintendence of young Anthony Ashley's education, he appears not yet to have abandoned his old intention of making medicine his regular profession. His other employments and the poor state of his health caused him to defer from time to time any direct action which he may have planned, and he never became in any orderly way a physician, but we shall find that to the end of his life he

¹ Boyle, 'Works,' vol. v., p. 152. I have not thought it necessary always to quote this authority for statements as to Locke's whereabouts from time to time.

continued to practise among his friends, and to accumulate notes of his own and other persons' experience in the treatment of all sorts of maladies. It may be assumed that, after leaving England, with the prospect of never returning to it, in 1683, he finally gave up his long-cherished plan of life, and that thenceforth his note-collecting and his friendly practising were continued out of mere good-nature and a liking for the pursuit; but it is clear that during the four years that we are now considering, or during most of the period, he was still waiting for an opportunity of devoting himself steadily to his favourite occupation. He was still generally spoken of by his friends as Dr. Locke, and he still regarded himself as, before everything else, a doctor.

Out of his journals, letters and other remains it would be easy to extract material enough to fill a volume with illustrations of his medical history. For the purposes of the present work, however, it is sufficient to give only a few specimens of this material, and such a brief account of his medical occupations as will serve to prevent this important current of his life from being lost sight of.

One entry in his journal, for example, dated the 4th of June, 1679, when he had hardly been a month in England, and might be supposed to be altogether engrossed in political business, describes a case of fever and diarrhoea which he had treated and cured; and on the 12th of the month, while he was taking a short holiday in an Essex village, we find him copying out several prescriptions that had been given to him by his friends, among them one received from Lady Shaftesbury, for vomiting, one from Dr. Tuberville, for disease of the eyes, and one from Mrs. Stringer, for hernia.¹ He constantly made such

¹ *Additional MSS.*, no. 15642.

entries, including among them, not only the prescriptions that he knew or thought to be the best, but also all others, not palpably improper, that he could collect from non-professional as well as professional friends. Whenever a cure or mode of treatment of any sort was reported to him, with anything at all to recommend it, he appears to have noted it down in order to examine it at leisure, and obtain from it all the help he could towards the collection of a complete body of prescriptions based on experience as well as on theory.

In a letter written to Mapletoft nine years before this time, which has already been quoted from, Locke spoke of a Mr. Beavis, who was then expected to die, and in his correspondence are several later references to Mrs. Beavis, who seems to have been a member of Lady Northumberland's family. What were his precise relations with these persons, or who they were, is not recorded; but Mr. Beavis, having recovered from his old ailment, was again dangerously ill at Olantigh, and thither, on the 18th of August, 1679, Locke posted down to attend upon him. In his journal are minute records of the progress and treatment of Mr. Beavis's malady, entered daily for a fortnight, and after that at intervals during the following month.¹ With Mr. Beavis's illness we need not concern ourselves. It is important, however, as showing us that Locke was now paying so much attention to medical work that, encouraged thereto perhaps by regard for his friend, he broke away from his occupations in London and spent several weeks in the country as a skilled physician called down to consult with the doctor employed on the spot.

An episode of this visit to the Kentish village, more-

¹ *Additional MSS.*, no. 15642.

over, claims attention. While there, in attendance on his friend, Locke himself fell ill. The illness was not very serious ; but the small fragment of autobiography referring to it, which is contained in his journal, is worth quoting, especially as it shows the characteristic mode of cure adopted by Locke in treating a low fever of a sort very common, almost universal in those times, and as it also helps us to see how bad drainage and other causes inclined vast numbers of the population to disease and premature death.

“ *September 5, Friday.*—When I waked this night, I found myself something ill in my stomach, but without any rigour or horror, or any sense of cold.

“ *September 6, Saturday.*—In the morning, about eight or nine, I began to fall into a sweat, which, without increasing the clothes I ordinarily had upon my bed, or taking anything but a little warm beer once or twice, continued with great violence, and a grievous pain in my head, till about eight or nine at night, and then, it being gone off, I rose ; but when I was up, I was very sick in my stomach, and had an inclination to vomit. I then drank a little sup of claret, which gave me present relief, and so, at three or four times taking the quantity of one glass of claret, it put an end to all my sickness, so that, though I was hot and unquiet in the night, yet I was without pain or sickness.

“ *September 7, Sunday.*—The next day, and so for three or four days after, whenever I found myself faint or ill at my stomach, I took a little claret, which presently relieved me and mended my pulse, which was always very quick when I was ill at my stomach. There was this odd circumstance, that during my sweating, the night after, and all the following day, my pulse was extremely unequal, sometimes beating exceeding quick, and then of a sudden changing to a sober natural throb for a pretty many pulses, and then running exceeding quick again, and thus changing every minute ; and this inequality, though something diminished, continued several days after. Query : whether it were from any *ἰδιοσυγκρασία*, my pulse having something of this inequality even in the time of my health, or from the nature of the disease ? Query : whether this sweat were a crisis of the distemper—which was epidemical tertian, very apt to run into a continued fever, which was all in this country and, as far as I have been, all over England—because

I found myself very apt to have a kind of faintness from my stomach, that which they all complained of? or else whether it were a change at once of my blood, by this sweat, into such a crisis as suited it to the constitution of the air of this season and year?

“The night after my sweat, as I remember, or else during my sweat itself, I found a subsulting, something like the strokes of a pulse, but unequal and at uncertain distances; but never failed to be several times in a minute in that part of my left hand which lies along betwixt the little finger and the arm-wrist, and is the softest fleshiest part of the hand. This subsulting went off as my stomach and strength came to me, and by Tuesday night left me quite. Query: whether this be from that sympathy between the hand and the stomach mentioned by Dr. Godefroi?

“September 11, Thursday.—I was taken again with my sweating fit, which held me as before twelve hours, but without any pain of the head or other sickness. I drank nothing but claret all this day, which did well with me.

“September 14, Sunday.—In the morning was very well, and so remained all day.”¹

It might seem strange that Locke should have preserved such a minute account of an illness that was not very serious, did we not know that he was in the habit of carefully noting down every peculiarity that came in his way, and that could be of service to him in his study and practice of medicine. Here was an epidemic, apparently, as he had but lately returned from long residence in France, new to him, and being able to diagnose it from his own unpleasant experience, he made the most of his knowledge.

Medical notes are very plentiful in Locke's journal during the ensuing months. Thus, on the 20th of October, we have a full report of a curious and, in this instance, a very effectual method pursued by Dr. Sydenham for curing a woman who had repeatedly miscarried. An odd entry is dated the 22nd of November. “My Lady

¹ Additional MSS., no. 15642.

Cowper, upon wearing of perfumed gloves but a few hours, had all her hands and arms, as far as they reached, swollen and angry the same night, as if it had been an erysipelas. This redness and heat lasted several days after, with a great itching after eating. This always happens to her in the like occasion.”¹

The victims of fashion were perhaps even more numerous two centuries ago than now. About this time, it would seem, Locke, writing to his friend Edward Clarke, made special complaint of the vicious practice by which a great many were, then and for long after, deformed and educated for disease. “This consideration,” he said, “should, methinks, keep busy people, I will not say ignorant nurses and bodice-makers, from meddling in a matter they understand not; and they should be afraid to put nature out of the way in fashioning the parts, when they know not how the least and meanest is made. And yet I have seen so many instances of children receiving great harm from strait-lacing, that I cannot but conclude there are other creatures as well as monkeys who, little wiser than they, destroy their young ones by senseless fondness and too much embracing. Narrow breasts, short and stinking breath, ill lungs and crookedness are the natural and almost constant effects of hard bodice and clothes that pinch. That way of making slender waists and fine shapes serves but the more effectually to spoil them. Nor can there, indeed, but be disproportion in the parts when the nourishment prepared in the several offices of the body cannot be distributed as nature designs; and therefore what wonder is it if, it being laid on some part not so braced, it often makes a shoulder or a hip higher or bigger than its just proportion? ’Tis generally known

¹ *Additional MSS.*, no. 15642.

that the women of China, imagining I know not what kind of beauty in it, by bracing and binding them hard from their infancy, have very little feet; whereby the free circulation of the blood is hindered, and the growth and health of the whole body suffers. How often do we see that, some small part of the foot being injured by a wrench or a blow, the whole leg and thigh thereby lose their strength and nourishment and dwindle away! How much greater inconveniences may we expect when the thorax, wherein is placed the heart and seat of life, is unnaturally compressed and hindered from its due expansion!"¹

"The constitution of this autumn," Locke wrote in his journal on the 15th of November, 1679, "was intermittent and quartanary, though many of the fevers in the beginning were continued, and several made so by ill management. In September, several children had whooping coughs. After October, no more ordinary agues, but such as returned. In November, all the world in London had violent coughs, without spitting, which were from hot steams irritating the lungs." "The bill of mortality this week"—that is, for London and the suburbs—he wrote on the 27th of the same month, "increased 222, as that of the week before 213, in all 435 in the fortnight—an increase scarce ever known out of times of pestilential diseases. The epidemical disease that came in about this time, and caused this mortality, was a dry, but violent cough, which produced a peri-pneumonia."²

That, though not new in his case, was the malady with which Locke was most afflicted, and which, probably, only extreme care in the treatment of himself had prevented

¹ 'Some Thoughts concerning Education,' §§ 11, 12.

² *Additional MSS.*, no. 15642.

from passing into a rapid consumption. Therefore special interest attaches to an account of the malady which he drew up as the result of Dr. Sydenham's observation confirmed by himself.

"The first and most common sort of phthisis," we there read, "is that which is laid in a cough taken in the winter season. For a little while before the winter solstice, upon the first approach of some bitter cold, almost everybody coughs; the transpiration being suddenly checked and a plaga being inflicted upon nature, it is no longer able to keep within compass those crude and, as it were, winter particles which were laid up in the blood from conformity to that season, but discharges them on the lungs, either immediately by the branches of the vena arteriosa," (which we now call the pulmonary artery,) "or first by the arteries upon the spongy parts and glandules that constitute the fauces, and thence into the aspera arteria," (that is, the trachea,) "and so into the lungs. Some, by ill management, or having weak lungs, keep these coughs so long that their lungs at length are much debilitated by the innumerable succussions that are continually made in the act of coughing, and so are rendered unfit to assimilate the blood that is brought to them for their nourishment, which therefore is laid up, and constitutes the greatest part of the matter which is expectorated by cough; besides, that in this case, other indigested humours from other parts are sent to the lungs, as being the weakest part. Nor is this all the mischief, that the lungs are not able to digest their own nourishment, by reason of their being thus weakened; but hence also proceeds, in process of time, that extravasated matter is collected up and down in the vesiculæ of the lungs, which at length hath little bags or cystides growing about it, the matter contained in them turning by degrees into pus. Nor is it only usual in this case, but in other cases also, where there is an extravasation of a juice or humours long residing upon a part, as we see such bags are formed by nature after long jaundices and dropsies; for nature seeks to preserve the parts from the injury of the matter so long as it can. The lungs being thus repleted with pus, from them flow purulent streams into the blood, which cause a sort of putrid fever, whose access is towards night, and its solution towards the morning, by a profuse and weakening sweat. Lastly, towards the completing of this tragedy, comes on a diarrhœa colliquativa, which arises partly from the putrid matter discharged on the bowels by the mesenteric arteries, and partly from the tone of the bowels being lost and destroyed; and then death is at hand. When this cough hath continued long, then the

patient begins to sweat at night, which is the first sign of a consumption coming on; and after this he begins to have a hectic heat, which withers his body and leaves on his face, especially his cheeks, a light redness; and presently after he begins to spit up yellow matter like pus, but not it. And when the mischief shall have so far advanced that both nocturnal sweatings and the diarrhœa colliquativa meet together, the disease is consummate and death at hand, though the patient all this while hath a serenity of mind and flatters himself with an opinion of recovery, which is usual in this disease, even to the very last, as those who die upon the coming out of tokens in the plague.

“The frequency of consumptions in London,” this memoir continues, “is for that we live here in a perpetual mist, the sun not being powerful enough to dissipate the clouds, and with this mist are mixed the fumes that arise from the several trades managed here, but especially the sulphur and fumes of sea coals, with which the air is repleted; and these being sucked into our lungs, and insinuated into the blood itself, give an occasion to a cough. What may be in coals which may contribute towards a consumption I know not, but sure I am, because I see it and smell it, that there is a good store of sulphur in them; which let them look to who extol sulphureal medicaments so much for the cure of consumptions. And in Newcastle, as I'm credibly informed, there are more consumptions in proportion to its inhabitants, than are almost anywhere else to be found. However it be, we see that people upon the winter's coming on, returning out of the country into London, presently fall a-coughing, and these coughs do as easily vanish the first day's journey after they leave London.”

The medicinal treatment proposed for the cure of this malady¹ need not here be detailed, especially as a better remedy was suggested. “By the above mentioned method,” it is added, “I have cured many: if it hath failed at any time, I have not known that long and persistent riding in a good air, which refreshes both the lungs and the blood, detained with hectic heat, hath ever failed, and though riding hath done well in hypochondrial and other distempers, yet it does better in a phthisis than in any other case; for by such repeated succussions of the lower belly, in which are seated most of the separatory² glandular organs, those are put upon the performing their several functions by having their natural heat excited, and the blood is by that means depurated, and as it were churned anew. In his journeys he need observe no diet, but may eat and drink what best

¹ See Sydenham, *Opera Omnia* (ed. Greenhill, 1848), p. 610.

² *Sic.*

agrees with his appetite; only let him take care that the linen in which he lies be dry, for the dampness of it will quickly bring back all the mischief."¹

The memoir 'De Phthisi,' from which those passages have been quoted, is contained in a very curious manuscript volume, or so much of it as has been preserved, in Locke's handwriting, and entitled by him 'Extracts of Sydenham's Physic Books, and Some Good Letters on Various Subjects.'² None of the letters are extant, and about the portions of the volume that we have there is some mystery. It appears to have been compiled in 1685 or after, when, living in Holland, Locke probably thought it well to bring into one collection all or all the more important of the medical notes in his possession representing the joint work of himself and his friend. Reference has been made in a previous chapter to a fragment of Locke's, entitled 'Tussis.' In the fragment was contained the substance, differently expressed, of part of the paper 'De Phthisi,' and that fragment was annotated by Sydenham. The matter was again reproduced, more compactly, in Sydenham's 'Processus Integri,' and nearly all the contents of the 'Extracts of Sydenham's Physic Books' are similarly reproduced in some or other of the great physician's published writings. How far the 'Extracts' are merely transcripts from Sydenham's notes, and how far they include traces of Locke's own work, cannot be decided; but, as we know that, at an earlier period, the two men were working together very closely, and also that on Locke's return from France their inti-

¹ 'Anecdota Sydenhamiana' (1847), pp. 1—16.

² 'Rawl,' c. 406, in the Bodleian Library; published by Dr. Greenhill, with the title 'Anecdota Sydenhamiana,' in 1845, a second edition being printed in 1847. Dr. Greenhill was not aware of Locke's hand in the work.

macy was maintained, we may assume that their old relations as regards medical work were to some extent renewed. The 'Extracts' show, at any rate—many of the contents being marked "ex ore Syd.," and dated 1682 or 1683—that Locke was still in the habit of inspecting Sydenham's manuscripts, and following very closely the progress of his medical work.

The paper 'De Phthisi' is of particular value to us as containing a graphic account of the malady from which he suffered, and specifying the common-sense method by which chiefly, it would seem, though he did not cure himself, he was able to keep alive and at work till the age of seventy-two. The other contents of this volume need only be briefly described. They comprise memoirs on disease of the kidneys, on apoplexy, and on epilepsy in children, together with sixteen shorter papers arranged in chapters, and said to be "excerpta ex ore DD. Syd., annis 1682-3." These treat of miscarriage, delirium, gout, colic, parturition, pleurisy, asthma, paralysis, dropsy, small-pox, and other maladies.

Locke's personal intercourse with Sydenham probably came to an end in 1683; but they appear to have corresponded afterwards. Sydenham's death in 1689 terminated an acquaintance that had lasted at least twenty years, and, if it may have done much towards inclining the greatest of English philosophers to pursue his early studies in physic, cannot but have also had a considerable effect in quickening the philosophical temper of the greatest of English physicians. It is much to be regretted that we do not know more of the long and hearty friendship that undoubtedly existed between the two men.

One at least among Locke's other friends, Robert

Boyle, like him, paid much attention to the study of medicine without making it a profession. Boyle wrote some 'Memoirs for the Natural History of the Human Blood,' which, alleging that he had undertaken the work at this person's request, he addressed, on the 22nd of December, 1683, "to the very ingenious and learned Dr. J. L."¹ As Boyle does not seem to have had any other friend bearing these initials, it is fair to infer that Dr. J. L. was John Locke.

In 1680 Locke's old acquaintance and Lord Shaftesbury's *protégé*, Edward Stillingfleet, now dean of St. Paul's, and looking for further promotion at the hands of Charles the Second, preached and afterwards published a sermon on 'The Mischief of Separation,' full of abuse of the protestant dissenters. This was promptly answered by Locke's former principal at Christ Church, Dr. Owen, by Richard Baxter, John Howe, Vincent Alsop, and others; and in 1681 Stillingfleet issued a ponderous rejoinder to all these replies, and a learned attack on non-conformity, which he styled 'The Unreasonableness of Separation.' This second and larger firebrand was even more offensive than the first, and among a score of treatises long and short to which it gave rise, and many of which were published, was one of considerable length, but never published, by Locke.

This treatise, which he entitled 'A Defence of Non-conformity,' was probably written, after Locke's fashion, merely as a statement of the logical outcome of principles that he had long before arrived at, without any thought of publishing it. It is possible also that it was not written

¹ Boyle, 'Works,' vol. iv., p. 161.

till after the period at which we have now arrived. But as it evidently expressed the opinions that were revived and strengthened in Locke's mind by the reading of Stillingfleet's publications in 1680 and 1681, this is the most appropriate place in which to take account of it, and especially of some of its welcome illustrations of his honest and intelligent zeal for religious liberty.

Locke made short work of Stillingfleet's elaborate plea for obedience to the dictates of the church of England or any other church claiming to be divinely appointed. "All the arguments used from the church, or established church," he said, "amount to no more than this, that there are a certain set of men in the world upon whose credit I must without further examination venture my salvation, so that all the directions and precepts to 'examine doctrines,' 'try the spirit,' 'take heed what you believe,' 'hold the truth,' etc., are to no purpose, when all the measure and stamp of truth, whereby I am to receive it, will then be only the hand that delivers it, and not the appearance of rectitude it carries with it. This is to deal worse with men in the great eternal concernment of their souls than in the short and trivial concernment of their estates; for, though it be the allowed prerogative of princes to stamp silver and gold, and thereby make them current money, yet every man has the liberty to examine even those very pieces that have the magistrate's stamp and image, and if they have the suspicion and appearance of a false alloy, they may avoid being cozened, and not receive them; the stamp makes it neither good nor current. But no authority that I know on earth, unless it be the infallible church of Rome, boldly claims a right to coin opinions into truths, and make them current by their authority; and yet in all places all men are unreasonably required to receive and profess doctrines for truths, because this governor or that priest says they are so. Yet, how senseless soever, it helps not the case, nor profits the opinions of any one sort of them; for, if the pope demands an obedient faith to him and his emissaries, the bishops of England tell us that they, and such as have episcopal ordination under them, are the true church, and are to be believed—the presbyterians tell us those of presbyterian ordination have no less authority, and that in all matters of doctrine and discipline they are to be believed—the independents and anabaptists think they have as much reason to be heard as the former—and the quakers think themselves the only true guides, whilst they bid us be guided by the light within us. All these we have within ourselves, every one of them calling on

us to hearken to them, as the sole deliverers of unmixed truth in doctrine and discipline : this they all do severally with the same confidence and zeal, and, for aught I know, with the same divine authority ; for, as for human authority, I am sure that weighs nothing in the case, if we will look further, and add to these the Lutheran, Greek, Armenian, Jacobite, and Abyssinian churches, and yet further out of the borders of Christianity, into the Jewish synagogues and Mahometan mosques—for the mufti and the rabbis are men of authority, and think themselves as little deceivers or deceived as any of the rest. What will it avail then to the church of England, among so many equal pretenders, to say they are the true church, and must be believed, and have the magistrate on their side, and must be obeyed ? ”¹

Ceremonies being the great rock of offence to protestant dissenters, Stillingfleet had attempted to prove that the church of England had retained in its services none that could be omitted with due regard to the method and example of the church of the apostles. This Locke denied, and he supported his denial by a careful review of ecclesiastical history, and by many instances of the way in which Luther, Calvin and their successors had conceded all they could in the way of ceremonies, and adopted many of which they did not approve, in order to conciliate those converts from catholicism who agreed with them in doctrine, yet clung to the pompous forms of worship to which they had been accustomed. “ I have been thus particular,” he said, “ to show what governed those wise and pious reformers in their proceedings at that time ; and we may observe all through that the great difficulty that pressed them was how they might lessen the ceremonies without lessening their converts.” “ At the beginning of the Reformation, the people who had been bred up in the superstition and various outward forms of the church of Rome, and had been taught to believe them substantial and necessary parts, nay, almost the essence of religion, could not so easily quit their reverent opinion of them ; and therefore, in a church that endeavoured to bring over as many converts as they could, the retaining of as many of those ceremonies as were not unlawful was then to enlarge the communion of the church, and not narrow it : since the people at that time were apt to take offence at the too few rather than too many ceremonies. So that ceremonies then had one of their proper ends, being a means to edification, when they were inducements to the people to join in communion with the church, where better care was taken for their instruction. But the sad experience of these latter years makes it, I fear, but too

¹ Lord King, pp. 341, 342.

plain that the case is now altered : and as we at present stand with the church of Rome, we have more reason to apprehend we shall be lessened by the apostasy of those of our church to them, than increased by gaining new proselytes from them to us. The harvest for such converts has been long since at a stand, if not an ebb ; and, being therefore likelier to lose than gain by any approaches we make towards them in outward agreement of rites and ceremonies, the retaining now of such, though lawful, cannot but in that respect be injurious to our church, especially if we consider how many there are on the other side who are offended at and shut out by the retaining of them. And, therefore, the taking away of as many as possible of our present ceremonies may be as proper a way now to bring the dissenters into the communion of our church, as the retaining as many of them as could be was of making converts at the Reformation. So that what then was for the enlargement, now tends to the narrowing of our church, and *vice versâ*. Since dissenters may be gained, and the church enlarged, by parting with a few things, which, when the law which enjoins them is taken away, are acknowledged to be indifferent, and therefore may still be used by those that like them, I ask whether it be not, not only prudent, but a duty incumbent on those whose business it is to have a care of the salvation of men's souls, to bring members into the union of the church, and so to put an end to the guilt they are charged and lie under of error and schism and division, when they can do it at so cheap a rate ? whereas, whatever kindness we may have for the souls of those who remain in the errors of the church of Rome, we can have small hopes of gaining much by concessions on that side."¹

And if the arguments from expediency were altogether in favour of a simple and comprehensive ritual that could give offence to no reasonable protestants, and could serve in uniting them in opposition to the church of Rome, Locke insisted that the early history of Christianity afforded no precedents at all for such a system of church discipline as Stillingfleet and the Romeward-tending church of England advocated and enforced. "To understand the extent, distinction and government of particular churches," he said, "it will be convenient to consider how Christianity was first planted and propagated in the world. The apostles and evangelists went up and down, preaching the new doctrine and, the better to propagate it, went from city to city, or one great town to another, and there published their doctrines where great collections of men gave them hopes of most converts. Having made a sufficient number of proselytes in any town, they chose out of them a certain

¹ Lord King, pp. 347, 349, 350.

number to take care of the concernments of that religion : these they called the elders, or bishops, who were to be the governors of that city, which so became a particular church, formed much after the manner of a Jewish synagogue. Such a constitution of a church we find at Ephesus and in several other cities. When a church was thus planted in any city, these itinerant preachers left it to grow and spread of itself, and from thence, as from a root, to take in not only those who from thenceforth should be converted in the city, but in the neighbouring villages ; and having done this, I say, they went to plant the gospel in several other cities." "The particular churches in different cities, directed by the prudence and enlarged by the preaching of the presbyters under whose care they were left, spread themselves, so that, in succession of time, in some places, they made great numbers of converts in the neighbourhood and villages round about, all which so converted made an accession to and became members of the church of the neighbouring city, which became an episcopacy, *παροικια*, from which our own name parish comes, the diocese, which was the name that remained in use for a bishop's diocese a good while in the church. How far the *παροικια* in the first times of Christianity reached, the signification of the word itself, which denotes neighbourhood, will easily tell us, and could certainly extend no farther than might permit the Christians that lived in it to frequent the Christian assemblies in the city, and enjoy the advantage of church communion." "Every great town, wherein there were Christians, was a distinct church, which took no greater extent round about for its *parochia* than what would allow the converts round about to have the convenience of communion and church fellowship in common with the assemblies of Christians in that town. But afterwards, when these churches were formed into episcopacies, under the government of single men, and so became subjects of power and matter of ambition, these *parochias* were extended beyond the convenience of church communion ; and, human frailty when it is got into power naturally endeavouring to extend the bounds of its jurisdiction, episcopal *parochias* were enlarged, and that name, being too narrow, was laid by, and the name of diocese, which signifies large tracts of ground, was taken to signify a bishopric ; which way of uniting several remote assemblies of Christians and churches under one governor, upon pretence of preventing schism and heresy, and preserving the peace and unity of the church, gave rise to metropolitans and archbishops, and never stopped, nor indeed upon that foundation well could it, till it at last ended in supremacy."¹

¹ Lord King, pp. 352—354.

Except in its detailed justification of the rights of dissenters from the established church to group themselves in independent churches, subject to any discipline on which they were agreed among themselves and which did not assail the rights and liberties of any who were outside of them, this 'Defence of Nonconformity' contained little that Locke had not sketched out some fifteen years before in his 'Essay concerning Toleration,' and did not afterwards more fully set forth in his published works. But in writing the treatise he showed how closely and with what generous sympathies he watched the religious and ecclesiastical polemics of the later and ugliest years of Charles the Second's reign.

That his own views were becoming too liberal for him to submit to the dogmas of any then existing sect, whether conformist or non-conformist, may be safely inferred from numerous entries made in his journals and commonplace books during these years. As specimens of them, three remarkable paragraphs on vexed questions of theology may here be quoted.

The first is dated Sunday, the 7th of August, 1681:—

“Whatsoever carries any excellency with it, and includes not imperfection, must needs make a part of the idea we have of God. So that with being, and the continuation of it, or perpetual duration, power and wisdom and goodness must be ingredients of the perfect or super-excellent being which we call God, and that in the utmost or infinite degree. But yet, that unlimited power cannot be an excellency without it be regulated by wisdom and goodness; for, since God is eternal and perfect in his own being, he cannot make use of that power to change his own being into a better or another state; and therefore all the exercise of that power must be in and upon his creatures, which cannot but be employed for their good and benefit, as much as the order and perfection of the whole can allow each individual in its particular rank and station. And, therefore, looking on God as a being infinite in goodness as well as power, we cannot imagine he hath made anything with a design that it should be miserable, but that he hath

afforded it all the means of being happy that its nature and estate is capable of, and though justice be also a perfection which we must necessarily ascribe to the Supreme Being, yet we cannot suppose the exercise of it should extend farther than his goodness has need of it for the preservation of his creatures in the order and beauty of the state that he has placed each of them in ; for since our actions cannot reach unto him, or bring him any profit or damage, the punishments he inflicts on any of his creatures, *i.e.* the misery or destruction he brings upon them, can be nothing else but to preserve the greater or more considerable part, and so, being only for preservation, his justice is nothing but a branch of his goodness, which is fain by severity to restrain the irregular and destructive parts from doing harm ; for to imagine God under a necessity of punishing for any other reason but this, is to make his justice a great imperfection, and to suppose a power over him that necessitates him to operate contrary to the rules of his wisdom and goodness, which cannot be supposed to make anything so idly as that it should be purposely destined or be put in a worse state than destruction (misery being as much a worse state than annihilation as pain is than insensibility, or the torments of a rack less eligible than quiet sound sleeping). The justice then of God can be supposed to extend no further than infinite goodness shall find it necessary for the preservation of his works." ¹

The following was written six weeks later, on the 18th of September, 1681 :—

“ Religion being that homage and obedience which man pays immediately to God, it supposes that man is capable of knowing that there is a God, and what is required by and is acceptable to him, thereby to avoid his anger and procure his favour.

“ That there is a God, and what that God is, nothing can discover to us, nor judge in us, but natural reason. For whatever discovery we receive any other way must come originally from inspiration, which is an opinion or persuasion in the mind whereof a man knows not the rise nor reason, but is received there as a truth coming from an unknown and therefore a supernatural cause, and not founded upon those principles or observations in the way of reasoning which make the understanding admit other things for truths. But no such inspiration concerning God, or his worship, can be admitted for truth by him that thinks himself thus inspired, much less

¹ Lord King, p. 122.

by any other whom he would persuade to believe him inspired, any farther than it is conformable to reason ; not only because where reason is not, I judge it is impossible for a man himself to distinguish betwixt inspiration and fancy, truth and error ; but also it is impossible to have such a notion of God as to believe that he should make a creature to whom the knowledge of himself was necessary, and yet not to be discovered by that way which discovers everything else that concerns us, but was to come into the minds of men only by such a way by which all manner of errors come in, and is more likely to let in falsehoods than truths, since nobody can doubt from the contradiction and strangeness of opinions concerning God and religion in this world, that men are likely to have more frenzies than inspirations. Inspiration then, barely in itself, cannot be a ground to receive any doctrine not conformable to reason.

“ In the next place, let us see how far inspiration can enforce on the mind any opinion concerning God or his worship, when accompanied with a power to do a miracle ; and here, too, I say, the last determination must be that of reason.

“ 1st. Because reason must be the judge what is a miracle and what not ; which, not knowing how far the power of natural causes do extend themselves, and what strange effects they may produce, is very hard to determine.

“ 2nd. It will always be as great a miracle that God should alter the course of natural things, to overturn the principles of knowledge and understanding in a man, by setting up anything to be received by him as a truth which his reason cannot assent to, as the miracle itself ; and so at best, it will be but one miracle against another, and the greater still on reason’s side ; it being harder to believe that God should alter, and put out of its ordinary course some phenomenon of the great world for once, and make things act contrary to their ordinary rule, purposely that the mind of man might do so always afterwards, than that this is some fallacy or natural effect, of which he knows not the cause, let it look never so strange.

“ 3rd. Because man does not know whether there be not several sorts of creatures above him, and between him and the Supreme, amongst which there may be some that have the power to produce in nature such extraordinary effects as we call miracles, and may have the will to do it, for other reasons than the confirmation of truth ; for the magicians of Egypt turned their rods into serpents as well as Moses ; and since so great a miracle as that was done in opposition to the true God, and the revelation sent by him, what miracle can have certainty and assurance greater than that of a man’s reason ?

“ And if inspiration have so much the disadvantage of reason in the man

himself who is inspired, it has much more so in him who receives the revelation only by tradition from another, and that, too, very remote in time and place.

“I do not hereby deny in the least that God can do, or hath done, miracles for the confirmation of truth ; but I only say that we cannot think he should do them to enforce doctrines or notions of himself, or any worship of him not conformable to reason, or that we can receive such for truth for the miracle’s sake : and even in those books which have the greatest proof of revelation from God, and the attestation of miracles to confirm their being so, the miracles are to be judged by the doctrine, and not the doctrine by the miracles (*v.* Deut. xiii. 1 ; Matt. xiv. 24). And St. Paul says, ‘If an angel from heaven should teach any other doctrine,’ etc., etc.”¹

This other passage, which, whatever other value it may have, is a tolerably complete refutation of the Cartesian theory of the immortality of the soul, was written on the 20th of April, 1682.

“The usual physical proof (if I may so call it) of the immortality of the soul is this : matter cannot think, *ergo*, the soul is immaterial ; nothing can really destroy an immaterial thing, *ergo*, the soul is really immaterial.

“Those who oppose these men, press them very hard with the souls of beasts ; for, say they, beasts feel and think, and therefore their souls are immaterial, and consequently immortal. This has by some men been judged so urgent, that they have rather thought fit to conclude all beasts perfect machines, rather than allow their souls immortality or annihilation. Both which seem harsh doctrines ; the one being out of the reach of nature, and so cannot be received as the natural state of beasts after this life ; the other equalling them, in a great measure, to the state of man, if they shall be immortal as well as he.

“But methinks, if I may be permitted to say so, neither of these speak to the point in question, and perfectly mistake immortality ; whereby is not meant a state of bare substantial existence and duration, but a state of sensibility ; for that way that they use of proving the soul to be immortal will as well prove the body to be so too ; for, since nothing can really destroy a material substance more than immaterial, the body will naturally endure as well as the soul for ever ; and, therefore, in the body they distinguish betwixt duration and life or sense, but not in the soul ; supposing

¹ Lord King, pp. 123—125.

it in the body to depend on texture, and a certain union with the soul, but in the soul upon its indivisible and immutable constitution and essence; and so that it can no more cease to think and perceive than it can cease to be immaterial or something.

“ But this is manifestly false, and there is scarce a man that has not experience to the contrary every twenty-four hours. For I ask what sense or thought the soul (which is certainly then in a man) has during two or three hours’ sound sleep without dreaming, whereby it is plain that the soul may exist or have duration for some time without sense or perception; and if it may have for this hour, it may also have the same duration without pain or pleasure, or anything else, for the next hour, and so to eternity; so that to prove that immortality of the soul, simply because, it being naturally not to be destroyed by anything, it will have an eternal duration, which duration may be without any perception, is to prove no other immortality of the soul than what belongs to one of Epicurus’s atoms, viz., that it perpetually exists, but has no sense either of happiness or misery.

“ If they say, as some do, that the soul during a sound quiet sleep perceives and thinks, but remembers it not, one may, with as much certainty and evidence, say that the bed-post thinks and perceives too all the while, but remembers it not; for I ask whether during this profound sleep the soul has any sense of happiness or misery? and, if the soul should continue in that state to eternity, with all that sense about it whereof it hath no consciousness nor memory, whether there could be any such distinct state of heaven or hell, which we suppose to belong to souls after this life, and for which only we are concerned for an inquisitive after its immortality? And to this I leave every man to answer to his own self, viz., if he should continue to eternity in the same sound sleep he has sometimes been in, whether he would be ever a jot more happy or miserable during that eternity than the bedstead he lay on?

“ Since, then, experience of what we find daily in sleep, and very frequently in swooning and apoplexy, etc., puts it past doubt that the soul may subsist in a state of insensibility, without partaking in the least degree of happiness, misery, or any perception whatsoever (and whether death, which the Scripture calls sleep, may not put the souls of some men at least into such a condition, I leave those who have well considered the story of Lazarus to conjecture), to establish the existence of the soul will not prove its being in a state of happiness or misery, since it is evident that perception is no more necessary to its being than motion is to the being of body. Let, therefore, spirit be in its own nature as durable as matter, so that no power

can destroy it, but that omnipotence that at first created it, they may both lie dead and inactive, the one without thought, the other without motion, a minute, an hour, or to eternity, which wholly depends upon the will and good pleasure of the first Author. And he that will not live conformable to such a future state, out of the undoubted certainty that God can—and the strong probability, amounting almost to certainty, that he will—put the souls of men into a state of life or perception after the dissolution of their bodies, will hardly be brought to do it upon the force of positions which are, by their own experience, daily contradicted, and will at best, if admitted for true, make the souls of beasts immortal as well as theirs.”¹

Those and kindred passages show that in these years Locke allowed his speculations often to stretch beyond the limits of study necessary for the preparation of his ‘*Essay concerning Human Understanding* ;’ but other entries in his journal are evidently rough notes of thoughts that he afterwards re-shaped in the essay.

It is probable that in 1681 or 1682 Locke prepared the first of the ‘*Two Treatises on Government*’ which he published in 1690, and more than he then published, but the little that need be said on that work can be most appropriately said when both treatises are before us.²

Here, however, may be quoted, as an illustration of his literary exercise in a line that he did not very often follow, one of the few verse compositions of which we know him to be the author. Its exact date cannot be given, but, as it was copied into a sort of album, kept by

¹ Lord King, pp. 127—130.

² He was falsely charged with spending part of this time in writing violent political pamphlets in the interests of the extreme Whig party. “The pamphlet entitled ‘*No Protestant Plot*’ is with us,” Prideaux wrote from Oxford on the 25th of October, 1681, “and Locke is said to be the author of it.” (‘*Letters of Humphrey Prideaux to John Ellis*,’ p. 115.) See Locke’s solemn repudiation of all such writing, which will be quoted at the end of this chapter.

James Tyrrell,¹ and as he was much with Tyrrell in 1681 and 1682, at his house in Buckinghamshire, as well as in Oxford and London, we may guess that it was written in or near one of those years. The string of verses was addressed "to a young lady that could never be kept at home."

"Curse on the park, the plays, and business-too,
Which call those out that have ought else to do;
Business, the vast pretence wherein we lay
Snares to catch others and ourselves betray.

"For dust and crowd sully a virgin's mind,
Which greatest is when to itself confin'd;
'Tis to itself a world, and there doth see
Whate'er without is wild vacuity.

"Wise were our ancestors whose tender care
Shut up their daughters from the common air,
Where bold infections breed, and blasts that bring
Ruin to th' hopes and beauties of their spring:

"Kept then conceal'd at home, the shades they knew
Were to their sex as well as beauty due :-
Then they were goddesses, when they retired,
And what few only saw, all still admired.

"But when they wander'd out, and first began
To mix and traffic with ill-tutored man,
We our devotion lost, as you your state;
What once grows common loses its first rate.

"The glorious sun, to every sight being shown,
Is less admired than a poor polished stone;
The gods, shut up from mortals in the skies,
Are not themselves when seen by vulgar eyes.

¹ The manuscript volume is now in the possession of Lord Houghton, who has kindly permitted me to inspect it and to publish the lines, to which is appended this note in Tyrrell's handwriting, "By my dear friend, Mr. J. Locke."

“Jove lost his glory when he left 's abode :
He that was god at home was beast abroad.
We zealous votaries to their shrines may come ;
But they no deities can be from home.

“Then gad no more: the world is crowd and noise,
Which with false shows would tempt you from your joys.
Who wander out and tread the beaten way,
Quite from themselves and happiness do stray.
The streets perhaps some gazers may afford,
But home 's the heaven where you are ador'd.”

Locke as a poet was certainly no match for his school-fellow Dryden.

Acquitted on the 24th of November, 1681, and soon afterwards released from the Tower, where he had been illegally imprisoned, Lord Shaftesbury was received by the London populace with so much enthusiasm, not feebly echoed throughout the country, that the hatred with which he had hitherto been regarded by the king and the leaders of the catholic party was greatly increased, and he himself was led to count too much on his influence over the people and on the strength of his anti-catholic supporters. The partisans of the Prince of Orange being almost idle, he resolved to lose no time, not merely in asserting the title of the Duke of Monmouth to the crown in succession to Charles the Second, but in actually placing him on the throne at once. Whereas Lord Russell and his other political friends had previously urged him to energetic action, they now had to complain of his too great impetuosity. All through the summer of 1682 he was plotting for an insurrection, and, though Monmouth, Russell, and the others did not hold aloof from the plots, their persistent desire that the crisis

should be delayed until better chances of success were in sight, caused them to keep in the background.

Thus it happened that when, in September, the secret was partly disclosed, Monmouth though arrested was soon discharged on bail, with Russell for one of his sureties, and Shaftesbury found himself almost alone. After hiding for some weeks in Wapping, he made his way to Harwich in the disguise of a presbyterian minister, and thence, on the 28th of November, he escaped to Holland. Reaching Amsterdam a few days later, he soon afterwards fell ill, the gout which had long troubled him attacking him now in a vital part, and he died on the 31st of January, 1682-3. "I'll give an unhappy instance which I had from the very person in whose arms the late Earl of Shaftesbury expired," wrote an opponent, twenty-three years later. "He said, when he attended him at his last hours in Holland, he recommended to him the confession of his faith and the examination of his conscience. The earl answered him and talked all over Arianism and Socinianism, which notions he confessed he imbibed from Mr. Locke and his tenth chapter of 'Human Understanding.'" ¹

Locke had been in almost constant residence at Oxford from the 10th of February, 1681-2, till the 28th of May, and, with a week's interval when he was in London, and another week's interval when he was probably at St. Giles's, from the 14th of October till the 3rd of December.² Instead of taking any part in Shaftesbury's ill-planned and unwise conspiracy on behalf

¹ 'Letters addressed to Thomas Hearne,' edited by Frederick Ouvry, (privately printed, 1874), p. 9; Thomas Cherry to Thomas Hearne, 25 July, 1706.

² Boyle, 'Works,' vol. v., pp. 153—159.

of the Duke of Monmouth during that luckless year, there is good ground for inferring that he joined with others in vainly endeavouring to dissuade Shaftesbury from his rash action, and that, when he found his advice was of no avail, he went down to live quietly in his student's quarters at Christ Church, and there pursue his literary and medical studies.¹ There was no breach in his friendship for Shaftesbury, however, and no slackening of his

¹ There can be no doubt, however, that already the government had begun to set spies upon him, and to seek some ground for implicating him in Shaftesbury's movements. Curious evidence of this appears in the letters of Prideaux to Ellis. Ellis, afterwards under-secretary of state, was already in the employ of the government, and Prideaux's unfriendly and spiteful gossip was clearly supplied in answer to his inquiries. It shows what animosity existed against Locke, but is of no other value. "John Locke lives a very cunning, unintelligible life here," Prideaux wrote from Oxford on the 14th of March, 1681-2, "being two days in town and three out, and no one knows where he goes, or when he goes, or when he returns. Certainly there is some whig intrigue a-managing; but here not a word of politics comes from him, nothing of news, or anything else concerning our present affairs, as if he were not at all concerned in them. If any one asks him 'What news?' when he returns from a progress, his answer is, 'We know nothing.'" "Where J. L. goes," Prideaux wrote again on the 19th of March, "I cannot by any means learn, all his voyages being so cunningly contrived. Sometimes he will go to some acquaintances of his near the town, and then he will let anybody know where he is; but other times, when I am assured he goes elsewhere, no one knows where he goes, and therefore the other is made use of only for a blind. He hath in his last sally been absent at least ten days; where, I cannot learn. Last night he returned, and sometimes he himself goes out and leaves his man behind, who shall then be often seen in the quadrangle to make people believe his master is at home; for he will let no one come to his chamber, and therefore it is not certain when he is there or when absent." ('Letters of Humphrey Prideaux to John Ellis,' pp. 129, 131.) Had Locke been now busy with Shaftesbury's plots, he could not have chosen a less suitable centre of action than tory Oxford, where he would be away from all his accomplices and more likely than anywhere else to have his secrets detected.

efforts to render all the service in his power to the earl and to his family.

In October Lady Shaftesbury addressed to him from St. Giles's a very pathetic little letter, none the less pathetic because it shows her anxiety about her grandson's minor ailments while her husband was hiding for his life in Wapping.

“SIR,—Your great goodness and charity expressed to me and my good lord by your cares and kindness to our dear child at Clapham can never be enough acknowledged; and—though I must confess I was mightily troubled yesterday at the first reading of your letter, because Balls had before sent us word he had had a swelled face, which I apprehend he ought to be otherwise treated for than usual in such complaints, he having been all this year subject to a sharp humour that has griped him many times, and relieved only by a natural looseness—as your assurance in your second letter, by the grace of God, of his being out of danger gave me great hopes and joy, because of your kind concernment for him, so I trust in God my comfort will be increased by the knowledge of his perfect recovery from your own relation personally here, suddenly, who am impatient to express how much you have again obliged

“Your very faithful friend and servant,

“M. SHAFTESBURY.”¹

It would seem that Locke, on hearing of little Anthony Ashley's illness, had ridden up to London, where the boy was still under the care of Mrs. Elizabeth Birch, superintended by Locke himself, and, having put him in a fair way of recovery, went down to Dorsetshire on a visit to Lady Shaftesbury, probably to console her in the far heavier troubles by which she was now harassed, as well as to tell her about Anthony's health. The time had passed when she could have occasion to compliment him on his Cheddar cheeses; but perhaps she now found a

¹ Christie, vol. ii., p. 450; Lady Shaftesbury to Locke, 27 Oct., 1682.

special value in those translations from Pierre Nicole's essays which he had dedicated to her ten years before.

Locke was at Clapham, again looking after the lad, and, it would seem, himself lying ill, when the news of Shaftesbury's death arrived. Thence he wrote, along with others of the family, to the custodians of the body in Amsterdam, respecting the way in which it should be brought over to England.¹ He was doubtless one of the great company of mourners, including all the chief persons in the county as well as kinsfolk and dependants, political opponents as well as political allies, who followed the body in long procession from the landing-place at Poole to the family vault at St. Giles's; and he wrote for it an epitaph, though not the one that was placed over the tomb. "Comitate, acumine, suadela, consilio, animo, constantia, fide, vix parem alibi invenias, superiorem certe nullibi; libertatis civilis, ecclesiasticae, propugnator strenuus, indefessus. Vitae publicis commodis impensae memoriam et laudes, stante libertate, nunquam oblitterabit tempus edax, nec edacior invidia."²

¹ Christie, vol. ii., p. 460. I have not been able to find these letters.

² Appended to the fragment of 'Memoirs relating to the Life of Anthony First Earl of Shaftesbury,' first printed among 'The Posthumous Works of John Locke' (1706). This fragment comprises only a few rough notes of what Locke had heard about Shaftesbury's early life, with this interesting interpolation:—"I remember to have often heard him say concerning a man's obligation to silence, in regard of discourse made to him or in his presence, that it was not enough to keep close or uncommunicated what had been committed to him with that caution, but there was a general and tacit trust in conversation, whereby a man was obliged not to report again anything that might be any way to the speaker's prejudice, though no intimation had been given of a desire not to have it spoken again. He was wont to say that wisdom lay in the heart and not in the head, and that it was not the want of knowledge, but the perverseness of the will, that filled men's actions with folly and their lives with disorder; and that there was in every

Soon after the first Lord Shaftesbury's death, his grandson appears to have been taken out of Locke's and Mrs. Birch's charge by the new earl. Young Ashley, now twelve and a half years old, was sent to Winchester School in November, 1683,¹ and he was a warden's boarder there till 1688 at any rate, though his sensitive nature is said to have been much irritated, and his whole character was probably injured, by his schoolmates' sneers and reproaches on account of his grandfather's political failure and death in exile. We shall see more of Locke's relations with him hereafter. With his father Locke appears to have had very little further to do.²

Of Locke's movements and occupations during 1683 we have very meagre information. He was in London, however, on the 27th of April, when he wrote a very

one two men, the wise and the foolish, and that each must be allowed his turn. If you would have the wise, the grave, and the serious always to rule and have the sway, the fool would grow so peevish and troublesome that he would put the wise man out of order, and make him fit for nothing; he must have his times of being let loose to follow his fancies and play his gambols, if you would have your business go on smoothly. I have also heard him say that he desired no more of any man but that he would talk. 'If he would but talk,' said he, 'let him talk as he pleases.' And, indeed, I never knew any one penetrate so quick into men's breasts, and from so small an opening survey that cabinet, as he would. He would understand men's true errand as soon as they had opened their mouths and began their story in appearance to another purpose."

¹ *Shaftesbury Papers*, series iv., no. 2.

² "There is a letter of Locke's among the papers at St. Giles's," said Mr. Christie ('*Life of Shaftesbury*,' vol. ii., p. 431), "written to [the second earl] shortly after his father's death, reproaching him in a very frank and manly style for ungrateful and rude conduct to Shaftesbury's widow, his step-mother, who had been as a mother both to him and to his son." I have sought in vain for this letter; but among the *Shaftesbury Papers* are some very pathetic letters from the dowager-countess to the new earl and countess.

characteristic letter to Thomas Cudworth, the son of Dr. Ralph Cudworth, the Cambridge theologian and philosopher with whom he must have had some, if not very intimate, acquaintance during many years past. Young Cudworth was a fellow of Christ's College, who at the close of 1679 had obtained a seven years' dispensation, extended in 1686 for another seven years, in order that he might visit and reside in India.¹ The letter was as follows:—

“SIR,—Though you are got quite to the other side of the world, yet you cease not to make new acquisitions here; and the character you have left behind you makes your acquaintance be sought after to the remotest parts of the earth. There is a commerce of friendship as well as merchandise; and though nobody, almost, lets his thoughts go so far as the East Indies without a design of getting money and growing rich, yet, if you allow my intentions, I hope to make a greater advantage by another sort of correspondence with you there.

“In the conversation I have had the happiness to have sometimes with your sister here, I have observed her often to speak of you with more tenderness and concern than all the rest of the world, which has made me conclude it must be something extraordinary in you which has raised in her (who is so good a judge) so particular an esteem and affection, beyond what is due to the bare ties of nature and blood. And I cannot but think that your souls are akin, as well as your bodies, and that yours, as well as hers, is not of the ordinary alloy. I account it none of the least favours she has done me, that she has promised me your friendship; and you must not think it strange if I presume upon her word, and trouble you with some inquiries concerning the country you are in, since she encourages me in it and assures me I shall not fail of an answer.

“Some of those who have travelled, and writ of those parts, give us strange stories of the tricks done by some of their jugglers there, which must needs be beyond legerdemain, and seems not within the power of art or nature. I would very gladly know whether they are really done as strange as they are reported; and whether those that practise them are any

¹ *Domestic State Papers, Reign of William and Mary*; one of the miscellaneous and undated papers of 1689.

of them Mahometans, or all, which I rather suppose, heathens; and how they are looked on by the Brahmins and the other people of the country; whether they have any apparitions amongst them, and what thoughts of spirits; and as much of the opinions, religion and ceremonies of the Hindoos and other heathens of those countries as comes in your way to learn and inquire. It would be, too, great kindness, if you could learn any news of any copies of the Old or New Testament, or any parts of them, which they had amongst them, in any language, in those eastern countries, before the Europeans traded thither by the Cape of Good Hope. I should trouble you also with inquiries concerning their languages, learning, government, manners, and particularly Aurengzebe, the emperor of Hindostan, since I could promise myself a more exact account from you than what we have in printed travels; but I fear I have been more troublesome than what you will imagine will become a man that does but now begin to beg your acquaintance.

“If I have trespassed herein, you must excuse it to the little distinction I make between you and your sister; you must conclude I forgot myself, and thought I was talking to, and, as I use to do, learning something of her. And 'tis to the same account I must beg you to place the obligation you will lay on me, by procuring and sending hither an answer to the enclosed letter, directed to Mrs. Richards. Her husband died going to the East Indies, in a ship that set out hence about 'Christmas twelvemonths, where he was to have been factor, somewhere in the Bay of Bengal, for the company. His wife and two daughters, who were with him, went on their voyage. Where she settled herself, and remains now, you will easily know. I beg the favour of you to get the enclosed conveyed to her, and an answer from her, which be pleased to direct to be left for me either with Mr. P. Percevall, at the Black Boy, in Lombard-street, or Mr. S. Cox, at the Iron Key, in Thames-street, London.

“And now, having been thus free with you, 'tis in vain to make apologies for it. If you allow your sister to dispose of your friendship, you will not take it amiss that I have looked upon myself as in possession of what she has bestowed on me, or that I begin my conversation with you with a freedom and familiarity suitable to an established amity and acquaintance. Besides, if, at this distance, we should set out according to the forms of ceremony, our correspondence would proceed with a more grave and solemn pace than the treaties of princes, and we must spend some years in the very preliminaries. He that, in his first address, should only put off his hat and make a leg, and say, 'Your servant,' to a man at the other end of the world, may, if the winds set right, and the ships come home safe, and bring back

the return of his compliment—may, I say, in two or three years, perhaps, attain to something that looks like the beginning of an acquaintance, and by the next jubilee there may be hopes of some conversation between them.

“ Sir, you see what a blunt fellow your sister has recommended to you, as far removed from the ceremonies of the eastern people you are amongst, as from their country ; but one that, with great truth and sincerity, says to you,

“ I am, etc.,

“ J. LOCKE.

“ One thing, which I had forgot, give me leave to add ; which is, a great desire to know how the several people of the east keep their account of time, as months and years ; and whether they generally agree in using periods answering to our weeks ; and whether their arithmetic turns at ten as ours doth.”¹

The humour of that letter is very indicative of the character of the “blunt fellow” who wrote it, and it is welcome both for its evidence of Locke’s kindly interest in the widow of some friend or acquaintance who had died on his way out to India, and for its illustration of the omnivorous zeal with which he sought for information about oriental history, politics, theology, religion, customs, language, philosophy, science, and everything else that could help him towards understanding human nature in the concrete as a means towards a complete study “concerning human understanding” in the abstract. But it is most welcome of all, because there is hardly anything to replace it in this regard, for the light that it throws on Locke’s early intimacy with Thomas Cudworth’s sister, the Lady Masham of later years, whose reminiscences have already told us so much about Locke’s career, and of whom we shall see a great deal more hereafter.

Damaris Cudworth, born on the 18th of January, 1658-9, was now about twenty-four years old, her father being sixty-six. Of her early life we know nothing ; and as regards

¹ Lord King, p. 249 ; Locke to Thomas Cudworth, 27 April, 1683.

her early friendship with Locke we have only her own meagre and modest account to supplement the incidental information contained in Locke's letter to her brother. "My first acquaintance with him began," she said, "when he was past the middle age of man, and I but young. I can only truly pretend to have known him since his return out of Holland"—in 1689—"though before his leaving England in the year 1683, I had for a great part of above two years conversed frequently with him, and he favoured me sometimes with his correspondence during his continuance in Holland."¹

The acquaintance, therefore, commenced somewhere near the beginning of 1682, or perhaps a few months earlier, when, if Dr. Cudworth was in London during the memorable autumn in which the exclusion bill was being discussed and all honest protestants were gloomily anticipating the prospect of a catholic supremacy, Locke may have met there both him and his daughter. Wherever he met her, he was at once attracted by her womanly graces and her intellectual powers. From her father she had evidently imbibed, not only much learning, but also a strong taste for philosophical studies. Either through her own force of character, however, or under the influence of Locke, she came to diverge widely from her father, to find that the true genius of Christianity was expressed, not in neo-Platonism, but in utilitarianism—if to her gospel we may apply a term that was not invented till long after her day. The ponderous wisdom of 'The True Intellectual System of the Universe' was purified in her mind by a temper altogether in harmony, whether reflected from it or not, with the temper that found utter-

¹ MSS. in the Remonstrants' Library; Lady Masham to Le Clerc, 12 Jan., 1704-5.

ance in 'An Essay concerning Human Understanding.' Bright, earnest, truthful, brave, as she must then have been, or she could not afterwards have been what she showed herself to be—with as much masculine strength in her temperament as there was feminine grace in his—she no sooner became acquainted with Loeke than she sat herself loyally at his feet and began to trim her lamp and furnish it with the oil of which he had such good store for all who sought it; and while she thought herself too young to claim the honour of his friendship, he discovered in her "a soul not of the ordinary alloy." The opinion he had formed of her, whom he did know, may be inferred from the opinion that he formed, on her report, and in deference to her "good judgment," of her brother on "the other side of the world," whom he had never seen.

This letter to Thomas Cudworth reminds us of the constant zeal with which, however broken in health, however harassed in all his surroundings, Locke set himself to the doing of any work that he had to do, and, which he always regarded as his chief work, to the accumulation of all the knowledge that could anyhow be brought within his reach. But it contains the last trace that we have of his residence in London for more than six years; and though, soon after writing it, he appears to have gone down to Oxford, we only know that he was gradually finding that neither in London, in Oxford, nor in any other part of England could he live much longer.

It is certain that he had had nothing to do with the later plots in which Shaftesbury had been engaged. It is also certain that he had nothing to do with the plotting now going on under the leadership of Lord Russell and Algernon Sydney. But he was known to be

a staunch whig, Shaftesbury's chosen friend, and he received his share of the hatred—now triumphant—that fell on Shaftesbury and all the whigs. “The times growing now troublesome to those of my Lord Shaftesbury's principles, and more especially dangerous for such as had been intimate with him,” said Lady Masham, “Mr. Locke with reason apprehended himself not to be very safe in England; for though he knew there was no just matter of accusation against him, yet it was not unlikely, as things then were, but that he might have come to be questioned, and should he upon any pretence have been put under confinement, though for no very long time, yet such was the state of his health that his life must have been thereby much endangered. On this account, therefore, he thought it most advisable to withdraw.”¹

He could not withdraw from London to Oxford with any thought of privacy or safety there. He did, indeed, go to Oxford shortly after writing the letter to young Cudworth, but apparently only to pack up his books and other treasures and make arrangements for a long absence from the university. By this time he must have become, at least partly, aware of the treachery that was being practised towards him by some men whom he had regarded as friends, men who were friends to him in their way, but heartier friends to the king and the government; and he must have discovered the danger that he incurred from remaining within reach of enemies who were no less treacherous because their enmity was avowed.

The contemptible and altogether reprehensible Rye House plot was discovered in the middle of June, and immediately after it the government received intimation

¹ MSS. in the *Remonstrants' Library*; Lady Masham to Le Clerc, 12 Jan., 1704-5.

of the larger and more excusable scheme in which Russell and Sidney were concerned. When the news reached Oxford, Locke was there, not intending to make a long stay, but moving freely about, dining and conversing at the college table, and showing to all who had eyes to discern the truth, that he was not a participator in either project. But he soon found that there was no safety in innocence, especially when he heard that some persons, with whom he had been intimately associated, through his connection with Shaftesbury, were now being arrested, and that his former acquaintance with them was being made a ground of suspicion against him.¹ He accordingly

¹ We must take for what they are worth the following sentences in a letter written by Prideaux to Ellis on the 19th of November, 1684, seventeen months after the time to which they relate. The West referred to was Robert West, who was implicated in the Rye House plot, and who gave evidence against Russell when he was tried in July, 1683. Stephen College, a follower of Shaftesbury's, had been indicted for treasonable words uttered at Oxford during the meeting there of the Six Days' Parliament in 1681; and the bill having been thrown out by the grand jury in London, he had been sent for trial at Oxford, where a more pliant jury, on trumped-up evidence, found him guilty, and had him executed in August. "Whiggism goes down apace," wrote Prideaux, "and the punishments of sedition and treason fall very heavily upon those that have so boldly been guilty of it in the late licentious times. Our friend John Locke is become a brother sufferer with them. As soon as the plot was discovered, he cunningly stole away from us, and in half a year's time no one knew where he was. It seems he transacted all affairs with West, and therefore, so soon as he was secured, he thought it time to shift for himself, for fear West should tell all he knew. When West was first taken, he was very solicitous to know of us at the table who this West was; at which one made an unlucky reply, that it was the very same person whom he treated at his chambers and caressed at so great a rate when College was tried here at Oxford; which put the gentleman into a profound silence, and the next thing we heard of him was that he was fled for the same."—'Letters of Humphrey Prideaux to John Ellis,' p. 139.

left Oxford soon after the 30th of June, that being the last day on which we know him to have been there,¹ and went down to Somersetshire, perhaps even then intending to go no further. But in August or September he quitted England;² and, after being in entire ignorance of his movements during some months, we shall next find him in Holland.

Before we trace his footsteps there we must take account of the immediate issue of his connection with Shaftesbury.

Whatever ill repute Locke may have acquired with the English authorities on account of his former political associations, and whatever danger to his personal liberty may have been caused by the suspicions with which he was regarded before he left England in the autumn of 1683, the suspicions and the ill repute were increased, and excusably, by his settlement in his new home. Holland was just then the centre of conspiracy against the established government of England. The Duke of Monmouth fled to the Hague very soon after Locke's voluntary exile began. There he at first only amused himself, and paid court to his sometime rival, the Prince of Orange; but some worthy, though misguided patriots, like the Earl of Argyle and Fletcher of Saltoun, and some worthless adventurers, like Lord Grey of Wark and Robert Fergusson, gathered round him; and it is not very strange that Locke should have been supposed to be of the number, or that the men who had known and hated him as Shaftesbury's most trusted adviser should have been now more anxious than ever to punish him for his real and

¹ Boyle, 'Works,' vol. v., p. 159.

² Lord King, p. 139.

supposed offences, and to restrain the mischievous action in which they assumed that he was engaged.

This must be remembered in palliation, though not in justification, of certain proceedings that have stirred up the unreasonable wrath of whig historians and ill-informed critics without number.¹ The exact nature and significance of these proceedings will be made most clear by quoting all the direct information that is extant on the subject.

It would seem that long before Locke's visit to Holland his known abilities had caused him to be credited with the authorship of the 'Letter from a Person of Quality to a Friend in the Country,' printed in 1675, which has already been referred to, and of other publications in defence of Shaftesbury. After his retirement worse productions were assigned to him.² "Mr. Locke had not been gone out of England above a year," said Lady Masham, "when he was accused of having writ some libellous pamphlets that were supposed to have come over from Holland, but have since been known to have been writ by others. This was the reason that I have ever heard

¹ See among other exaggerated statements the passages referring to this portion of Locke's life in Fox's 'History of the Reign of James the Second,' Macaulay's 'History of England,' and Lord King's 'Life of Locke.' I fear I may be blamed for qualifying their views and assertions; but Locke's memory is not to be honoured by exaggeration.

² He was also falsely charged with being in close intercourse with some of Monmouth's most despicable allies. "The last account we had of him from Holland," said Prideaux in the letter dated the 15th of November, 1684, which has already been quoted from, "was that he had consorted himself with Dare of Taunton, and they two had taken lodgings together in Amsterdam." ('Letters of Humphrey Prideaux to John Ellis,' p. 139.) It will be shown in the next chapter that Locke, though sometimes at Amsterdam, was now travelling about in Holland, and, apparently, purposely keeping out of the way of the conspirators at the Hague.

assigned of his majesty's sending to Dr. Fell, the bishop of Oxford and dean of Christ Church, to expel Mr. Locke that house immediately."¹

That message, written by the Earl of Sunderland, and dated the 6th of November, 1684, was thus worded:—

“MY LORD,—The king being given to understand that one Mr. Locke, who belonged to the late Earl of Shaftesbury, and has upon several occasions behaved himself very factiously and undutifully to the government, is a student of Christ Church, his majesty commands me to signify to your lordship, that he would have him removed from being a student, and that, in order thereunto, your lordship would let me know the method of doing it.

“I am, my lord, etc.,

“SUNDERLAND.”²

“The bishop,” Lady Masham went on to say in her narrative, “had ever expressed much esteem for Mr. Locke, and not only so, but had lived with him on terms of friendship, so that it is not to be doubted but that he received this harsh command with trouble. He presently sent to speak with Mr. Tyrrell about it, and was so well satisfied with Mr. Locke's innocence that, instead of obeying the order he had received, he summoned him to return home by the 1st of January following to answer for himself, signifying at the same time to the court what he had done.” “Dr. Fell,” wrote Locke himself, five years afterwards, when petitioning William the Third for reinstatement, “finding it against the rules of common justice, as well as the ordinary method of the college, to turn out any one without hearing or so much as being

¹ MSS. in the *Remonstrants' Library*; Lady Masham to Le Clerc, 12 June, 1704-5.

² *Shaftesbury Papers*, series viii., no. 22; whence the rest of the correspondence has also been taken from Locke's copies. It has been several times printed.

accused of any fact which might forfeit his place, especially one who had lived inoffensively in the college for many years, did, by a *moneo* affixed to the screen in the college hall, summon your petitioner, who was then in Holland, to appear at Christmas following to answer anything that should be alleged against him ; but this regular proceeding did not suit the designs upon the university.”¹

Locke and his friend Lady Masham generously said and implied more in exculpation of Dr. Fell's share in these proceedings than he said or implied for himself in the letter which he addressed to Sunderland on the 8th of November.

“RIGHT HON.,—“I have received the honour of your lordship's letter, wherein you are pleased to inquire concerning Mr. Locke's being a student of this house, of which I have this account to render ; that he being, as your lordship is truly informed, a person who was much trusted by the late Earl of Shaftesbury, and who is suspected to be ill-affected to the government, I have for divers years had an eye upon him, but so close has his guard been on himself, that after several strict inquiries, I may confidently affirm there is not any one in the college, however familiar with him, who has heard him speak a word either against or so much as concerning the government ; and although very frequently, both in public and in private, discourses have been purposely introduced, to the disparagement of his master, the Earl of Shaftesbury, his party and designs, he could never be provoked to take any notice or discover in word or look the least concern ; so that I believe there is not in the world such a master of taciturnity and passion. He has here a physician's place, which frees him from the exercise of the college, and the obligations which others have to residence in it, and he is now abroad upon want of health ; but notwithstanding that, I have summoned him to return home, which is done with this prospect, that if he comes not back, he will be liable to expulsion for contumacy ; if he does, he will be answerable to your lordship for what he shall be found to have done amiss ; it being probable that, though he may have been thus cautious here, where he knew himself to be suspected, he has laid himself more open in London, where a general liberty of speaking was used,

¹ Lord King, p. 176.

and where the execrable designs against his majesty, and his government, were managed and pursued. If he does not return by the 1st of January next, which is the time limited to him, I shall be enabled of course to proceed against him to expulsion. But if this method seem not effectual or speedy enough, and his majesty, our founder and visitor, shall please to command his immediate remove, upon the receipt thereof, directed to the dean and chapter, it shall accordingly be executed by, my lord,

“Your lordship’s most humble and obedient servant,

“J. OXON.”¹

The reply to that letter was prompt and imperative, being addressed to “the right reverend father in God, John, lord bishop of Oxon, dean of Christ Church, and our trusty and well-beloved the chapter there.”

“Right Reverend Father in God, and trusty and well-beloved, we greet you well. Whereas we have received information of the factious and disloyal behaviour of Locke, one of the students of that our college, we have thought fit hereby to signify our will and pleasure to you, that you forthwith remove him from his student’s place, and deprive him of all the rights and advantages thereunto belonging, for which this shall be your warrant; and so we bid you heartily farewell. Given at our court at Whitehall, 11th day of November, 1684.

“By his majesty’s command,

“SUNDERLAND.”²

On the 16th Dr. Fell wrote to Sunderland, informing him that “his majesty’s command for the expulsion of Mr. Locke from the college was fully executed;” and straightway he received an answer to the effect that “his majesty was well pleased with the college’s ready obedience to his commands for the expulsion of Mr. Locke.”³

This “expulsion of Mr. Locke” was certainly an arbitrary and unjust act; but, seeing what very arbitrary and grossly unjust acts were in those years being resorted to by Charles the Second, it cannot be wondered at. The

¹ *Shaftesbury Papers*, series viii., no. 22.

² *Ibid.*

³ *Ibid.*

act was, without doubt, illegal; but, probably, this was never understood either by King Charles or by Dr. Fell.

Dr. Fell evidently considered that he had stretched to the utmost limit of loyalty his duty to the king by proposing that Locke should have two months' grace in which to answer any charges that might be brought against him; and in further apology for him we must hear Lady Masham's sequel to the ugly story. "As Dr. Fell," she said, "was a man of great worth on many accounts, I cannot but subjoin to the relation of a matter wherein some have thought him blameable, what persuades me that, if he was so, he was so only through a principle of fear. It is that, several months after Mr. Locke's expulsion, I, who was then a young maid and unknown to be of Mr. Locke's acquaintance, being at Dr. Stillingfleet's house, the then dean of St. Paul's, since bishop of Worcester, I heard a friend of the bishop of Oxford's tell the dean that the bishop had often said that nothing had ever happened to him which had troubled him more than what he had been obliged to do against Mr. Locke, for whom he ever had a sincere respect, and whom he believed to be of as irreproachable manners and inoffensive conversation as was in the world."¹

Locke was in Amsterdam when he received Dr. Fell's summons to return to Oxford and answer any charge that might be brought against him. Though he soon abandoned the project and said, in writing to his friend, Nicolas Thoynard, on the 13th of November, I think that I shall pass this winter in Utrecht,"² it is evident that, on receiving the summons, he resolved to comply

¹ MSS. in the *Remonstrants' Library*; Lady Masham to Le Clerc, 12 Jan., 1704-5.

² *Additional MSS.*, no. 28753; Locke to Thoynard, [13—] 23 Nov., 1684.

with it immediately. "You might very well expect," wrote Thomas Herbert, his companion at Montpellier, who had succeeded to the earldom of Pembroke in August 1683, "that I, who have had so much satisfaction in the friendship I have so many years contracted with you, would be pleased at your design of coming hither this winter; but when I consider how prejudicial it may be to your health to leave that country, which I have often heard has much increased it, I can't but use my endeavours you should not remove till spring. I was much surprised when I heard the reason of your coming so soon; but as soon comforted myself when I considered how many men of good reputation, by being accused, have had an advantage publicly to prove themselves honest men. Certainly I, who know your actions, should be to blame to give credit to others' words. You may be assured nothing shall hinder me from hazarding all I am worth when it may be advantageous to such a friend."¹

Before receiving that letter, Locke had probably changed his plans about returning at once to England. Only a few days after hearing of the summons, he must have heard that the summons had been superseded by his arbitrary expulsion, and that accordingly the journey would be altogether futile. He must also, then or soon after, have heard of the special pretext for the harsh treatment that he had received.

There was unusual asperity in a letter that he wrote to the Earl of Pembroke on this occasion. "I have often wondered," he said, "in the way that I lived and the make I knew myself of, how it could come to pass that I was made the author of so many pamphlets, unless it was because I of all my lord's"—that is, Lord Shaftesbury's

¹ Lord King, p. 158; Pembroke to Locke, Nov., 1684.

—“family happened to have been most bred amongst books. This opinion of me I thought time and the contradictions it carried with it would have cured, and that the most suspicious would at last have been weary of imputing to me writings whose matter and style have, I believe—for pamphlets have been laid to me which I have never seen—been so very different that it was hard to think they should have the same author, though a much abler man than me. And it is a very odd fate that I did get the reputation of no small writer without having done anything for it; for I think two or three copies of verses of mine, published with my name to them, have not gained me that reputation. Bating these, I do solemnly protest, in the presence of God, that I am not the author, not only of any libel, but not of any pamphlet or treatise whatever, in part good, bad or indifferent.”¹

Of course Locke here meant only to say that he had published nothing. He had already written much.

¹ Christie, vol. i., p. 261; Locke to Pembroke, [23 Nov.—] 3 Dec., 1684.

MO/ IA 47 MB
BOURNE

φ
C

